A 2944

VINDICATION OF THE ANIMADVERSIONS ON FIAT LUX.

Wherein the Principles OF THE ROMAN CHURCH,

As to Moderation, Unity and Truth are Examined: And ſundry Important Controverſies concerning the Rule of Faith, Papal Supremacy, the Maſs, Images, &c. Diſcuſſed.

By *John Owen* D. D.

LONDON,
Printed for *Ph. Stephens* at the Gilded-Lion in St. *Pauls* Church-yard, and *George Sawbridge* at the Bible on *Ludgate* Hill. 1664.

Imprimatur,

Decemb. 9. 1663.

Tho. Grigg. R. in Christ. P. D. Humfr. Episc. Lond. à Sac. domesticis.

Fiat Lux was written by John Vincent Lan a Franciscan Fryar. Calamy's Abridg. of Ba Life. p. 221.

230.42
2575

TO THE READER.

Christian Reader,

ALthough our Lord Jesus Christ hath laid blessed and stable foundations of *Unity*, *Peace* and *Agreement* in judgement and affection amongst all his Disciples, and given forth Command for their attendance unto them, that thereby they might glorifie him in the world, and promote their own spiritual advantage: yet also foreknowing what effect the crafts of Satan in conjunction with the darkness and lusts of men would produce; that no *offence* might thence be taken against him, or any of his wayes, he hath forewarned all men by his Spirit what *Differences*, *Divisions*, *Schisms* and *Heresies* would ensue on the publication of

the Gospel; and arise even among them that should profess subjection unto his Authority and Law. And accordingly it speedily came to pass; For what *Solomon* sayes that he discovered concerning the *first Creation*, namely that *God made man upright, but he sought out many inventions*, or immixed himself in endless questions; the same fell out in the *new creation* or erection of the Church of Christ. The state of it was by him formed *upright*, and all that belonged unto it, were of *one heart*, and *one soul*. But this harmony and perfection of beauty, in answer to his Will and Institution lasted not long among them; many who *mixed* themselves with those Primitive converts, or *succeeded* them in their profession quickly *seeking out perverse inventions*. Hence in the dayes of the Apostles themselves there were not only *schisms and divisions* made in sundry Churches of their own planting, with disputes about Opinions and needless impositions by *those of the Circumcision* who believed; but also opposition was made unto the very *fundamental* Doctrines of the Deity and Incarnation of the Son of God, by the *Spirit of Antichrist* then entring into the world, as is evident from their Writings and *Epistles*. But yet as all this while our Lord Jesus Christ according to his promise preserved the root of

Love

Love and Unity amongst them who sincerely believed in him entire (as he doth still, and will do to the end) by giving the *one and selfsame spirit* to guide, sanctifie and unite them all unto himself; so the care and *Authority* of the Apostles during their abode in the flesh, so far prevailed, that notwithstanding some *temporary impeachments* of Love and Union in or amongst the Churches; yet no signal prejudice of any long continuance befell them. For either the miscarriages which they fell into, were quickly retrieved by them, the truth infallibly cleared, and provision made for *Peace, Unity and Moderation* in and about things of less concernment; or else the evil, guilt and danger of them, remained only with and upon some *particular persons*, the notoriety of whose wickedness and folly cast them out by common consent from the communion of all the Disciples of Christ. But no sooner was that *sacred Society* ὁ ἱερὸς Ἀποστόλων χόρος with their immediate successors, as *Egesippus* speaks in *Eusebius*, departed unto their rest with God, but that the Church it self, which untill then was preserved a pure and *incorruppted Virgin*, began to be vexed with abiding contention, and otherwise to degenerate from its primitive *original* purity. From thence forward, especially after the heat of bloody and fiery per-

ſecutions began to abate, far the greateſt part of *Eccleſiaſtical Records* conſiſts in relations of the *Diviſions, Differences, Schiſms and Hereſies* that fell out amongſt them who profeſſed themſelves the Diſciples of Chriſt. For thoſe failings errors and miſtakes which were found in men of peaceable minds, the Church indeed of thoſe dayes extended her *Peace and Unity*, if *Juſtin Martyr* and others may be believed, to ſuch as the *ſeeming* warmer *zeal*, and really colder *charity* of the ſucceeding Ages could not bear withal. But yet diviſions and diſputes were multiplyed into ſuch an exceſs, as that the *Gentiles* fetcht advantage from them not only to reproach all Chriſtians withall, but to deterr others from the profeſſion of Chriſtianity. So *Celſus* in his third Book deals with them; for ſaith he,

ἀρχόμενοι μὲν ὀλίγοι τε ἦσαν, καὶ ἓν ἐφρόνουν· ὡς πλῆθος δὲ σπαρέντες αὐθὶς αὖ τέμνονται καὶ σχίζονται καὶ στάσεις ἰδίας ἔχειν ἔκαστοι θέλουσι· καὶ ὑπὸ πλήθους πάλιν διϊστάμενοι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐλέγχουσιν· ἐνὸς ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἔτι κοινωνοῦντες εἴγε κοινωνοῦσιν ἔτι τοῦ ὀνόματος· αἱ τοῦτο μόνον ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ὅμως ἀξιοῦνται. *At firſt when they were but a few, they were of one mind, or agreed well enough: But being increaſed, and the multitude of them ſcattered abroad, they were preſently divided again and again; and every one would have his own party or diviſion; and as in a divided multitude oppoſed and reproved one another; ſo*

that

that they had no communion among themſelves, but only in name, which for ſhame they retain. So doth he for his purpoſe, as is the manner of men, *invidiouſly* exaggerate the differences that were in thoſe early times amongſt Chriſtians: for he wrote about the dayes of *Trajan* the Emperour: That others of them took the ſame courſe, is teſtified by *Clemens, Stromat. lib. 7. Auguſtin. lib. de Ovlb. c. 15.* and ſundry others of the antient Writers of the Church. But that no juſt offence as to the truth, or any of the wayes of Chriſt might hence be taken, we are as I ſaid before, *forewarned* of all theſe things by the Lord himſelf, and his Apoſtles; as alſo of the uſe and neceſſity of ſuch events and iſſues: Whence *Origen* cryes out τοῦτο θαυμαστὸν ὁ παῦλος εἰρηκέναι μοι δοκεῖ; *Moſt admirable unto me ſeems the ſaying of Paul,* There muſt be Hereſies amongſt you, that thoſe who are approved may be manifeſt. Nor can any juſt *exception* be hence taken againſt the Goſpel it ſelf: For it doth not belong unto the excellency or dignity of any thing to *free it ſelf* from all oppoſition, but only to preſerve it ſelf from being prevailed againſt, and to remain victorious, as the ſacred truths of Chriſt have done, and will do unto the end. Not a few indeed in theſe evil dayes wherein we live, the *ends of the world*, and the difficulties with which

which they are attended being come upon us, persons ignorant of *things past*, and regardless of *things to come*, in bondage to their *present lusts* and pleasures, are ready to make use of the pretence of *divisions and differences* among Christians, to give up themselves unto Atheism, and indulge to their pleasures like the beasts that perish *Let us eat and drink for to morrow we shall dye*: *Quid aliud inscribi poterat sepulchro bovis*! But whatever they pretend to the contrary, it may be easily evinced, that it is their *personal dislike* of that holy obedience which the Gospel requireth, not the differences that are about the Doctrines of it, which *alienates* their minds from the truth. They will not some of them foregoe all *Philosophical* inquiries after the nature and causes of things here below, though they know well enough that there was never any *agreement* amongst the wisest and severest that at any time have been engaged in that disquisition, nor is it likely that ever there will be so. And herein they can countenance themselves with the *difficulty*, *obscurity* and *importance* of the things inquired after. But as for the high and *heavenly mysteries* of the Gospel, the least whereof is infinitely of more importance, then any thing that the utmost reach and comprehension of humane wisdom can attain unto, they may be neglected and despised

deſpiſed becauſe there are *contentions* about them.

Hic nigræ ſuccus loliginis, hæc eſt
Erugo mera.

The truth is, this is ſo far from any *real ground* for any ſuch concluſion, that it were utterly impoſſible that any man ſhould believe the truth of *Chriſtian Religion*, if he had not ſeen or might not be informed that ſuch *contention and differences* had enſued in and about it; for that they ſhould do ſo, is plainly and frequently foretold in thoſe *ſacred oracles* of it, whereof if any one be found to fail, the veracity and authority of the whole may juſtly be called into queſtion; If therefore men will have a religion ſo *abſolutely facile* aud eaſie, that without diligence, endeavour, pains or enquiry, without laying out of their *rational abilities*, or exerciſing the faculties of their ſouls about it, without foregoing of their luſts and pleaſures, without care of miſtakes and miſcarriages, they may be ſecurely wrapt up in it, as it were *whither they will or no:* I confeſs they muſt ſeek for ſome other where they can find it, *Chriſtianity* will yield them no relief. God hath not propoſed an acquaintance with the *bleſſed concernments* of his Glory, and of their own eternal condition, unto the ſons of men upon

on any ſuch terms, as that they ſhould not need with all diligence to employ and exerciſe their *faculties of their ſouls* in the inveſtigation of them, in the uſe of the means by him appointed for that purpoſe, ſeeing this is the *chiefeſt end* for which he hath made us thoſe ſouls: And as for them, who in *ſincerity* give up their minds and conſciences unto his Authority and guidance, he hath not left them without an *infallible direction* for ſuch a diſcharge of their own duty as is ſufficient to guide and lead them in the middeſt of all *differences, diviſions and oppoſitions* unto reſt with himſelf; and the difficulties which are caſt upon any in their enquiring after truth, by the *errour* and *deviation* of other men from it, are all ſufficiently recompenced unto them, by the *excellency* and ſweetneſs which they find in the truth it ſelf, when ſought out with diligence according to the mind of Chriſt. And one ſaid not amiſs of old, ἔπομαι τὸν ἐπιμελῶς ἐνιδόντα ταῖς χριστιανισμοῦ αἱρέσεσι σοφώτατον χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι, *I dare ſay he is the wiſeſt Chriſtian, who hath moſt diligently conſidered the various differences that are in and about Chriſtianity*, as being built in the knowledge of the truth upon the beſt and moſt ſtable foundations. To this end hath the Lord Jeſus given us his *holy word*, a perfect and ſure Revelation of all that he would have us to *believe or do* in the worſhip of God.

This

This he commands us diligently to attend unto, to ſtudy, ſeach, and enquire after, that we may *know his mind* and do it. It is true in their enquiry into it, *various apprehenſions* concerning the ſenſe and meaning of ſundry things revealed therein have befallen ſome men in all ages; and *Origen* gives this as one occaſion of the differences that were in thoſe dayes amongſt Chriſtians, τοῦτο ſaith he ἠκολούθησε, διαφόρως ἐκδεξαμένων τοὺς ἅμα πᾶσι πιστευθέντας τῶν θείους λόγους τὸ γενέσθαι αἱρέσεις. Lib. 3. Con. Celſ. 1. *When many were converted unto Chriſtianity, ſome of them variouſly underſtanding the holy Scripture which they joyntly believed, it came to paſs that hereſie enſued.* For this was the *whole rule* of faith & unity in thoſe dayes; the means for ſecuring of us in them impoſed on us of late by the *Romaniſts*, was then not heard of, not thought of in the world. But moreover to obviate all *danger* that might in this matter enſue from the manifold *weakneſs* of our minds in apprehending ſpiritual things, the Lord Jeſus hath promiſed his *holy ſpirit* unto all them that believe in him, and ask it of him, to prevent their miſtakes and miſcarriages in the ſtudy of his word, and to *lead them into all that truth*, the knowledge whereof is neceſſary, that they may believe in him unto the end, and live unto him. And if they who diligently and conſcientiouſly without *prejudices*,

corrupt

corrupt ends or designs in obedience to the command of Christ, shall enquire into the *Scriptures* to receive from thence the *whole object* of their faith and rule of their obedience, and who believing his promise shall *pray for his Spirit*, and wait to receive him in and by the means appointed for that end, may not be, and are not thereby secured from all such mistakes and errours as may disintereſt them in the promises of the Gospel, I know not how we may be brought unto any *certainty* or assurance in the Truths of God, or the everlasting consolation of our own souls. Neither indeed is the nature of man *capable* of any further satisfaction in or about these things, unless God should work *continual miracles*, or give continually *special revelations* unto all individuals, which would utterly overthrow the whole nature of that faith and obedience which he requires at our hands. But once to suppose that *such persons* through a defect of the means appointed by Christ for the instruction and direction before mentioned may everlastingly miscarry, is to cast an unspeakable *reproach* on the goodness, grace and faithfulness of God, and enough to discourage all men from enquiring after the truth. And these things the *Reader* will find further cleared in the ensuing discourse, with a discovery of the *weakness*, falseness and insufficiency

of

of thoſe rules and reliefs which are tendred unto us by the *Romaniſts* in the lieu of them that are given us by God himſelf. Now if this be the condition of things in *Chriſtian Religion* as to any one that hath with ſincerity conſulted the Scripture, or conſidered the Goodneſs, Grace and Wiſdom of God, it muſt needs appear to be, it is manifeſt that mens ſtartling at it, or being offended upon the account of *diviſions and differences* among them that make profeſſion thereof, is nothing but a *pretence* to cloke and hide their *ſloth* and *ſupine* negligence, with their unwillingneſs to come up unto the *indiſpenſable condition* of learning the truth as it is in Jeſus, namely obedience *unto his whole will*, and all his commands ſo far as he is pleaſed to reveal them unto us. With others they are but *incentives* unto that diligence, and watchfulneſs, which the *things themſelves* in their *nature* high and arduous, and in their *importance* of everlaſting moment, require at your hands? Further on thoſe who by the means formentioned come to the knowledge of the truth, it is incumbent according as they are by Gods providence called thereunto, and as they receive ability from him for that purpoſe, to *contend earneſtly for it*. Nor is their ſo doing any part of the *evil* that attends *differences and diviſions*, but a means appointed by God himſelf for their *cure* and

removal,

removal, provided as the Apoſtle ſpeaks that they *ſtrive or contend lawfully*. The will of God muſt be done in the wayes of his own appointment. Outward *force* and *violence*, corporal puniſhments, *ſwords and faggots*, as to any uſe in things purely ſpiritual and religious, to impoſe them on the *conſciences* of men, are condemned in the *Scripture*, by all the *antient* or firſt writers of the Church, by ſundry *Edicts* and Laws of the Empire, and are contrary to the very *light of Reaſon* whereby we are men, and all the *principles* of it from whence mankind conſenteth and coaleſceth into civil ſociety. Explaining, declaring, proving and confirming the truth, convincing of *gainſayers* by the evidence of *common principles* on all hands aſſented unto, and right reaſon, with *prayer* and ſupplications for ſucceſs, attended with a *converſation* becoming the Goſpel we profeſs, is the way ſanctified by God unto the *promotion* of the truth, and the *recovery* of them that are gone aſtray from it. Into this work according as God hath imparted of his gifts and ſpirit unto them, ſome in *moſt ages of the Church* have been engaged; and therein have not contracted any guilt of the evils of the *contentions and diviſions* in their dayes, but cleared themſelves of them, and faithfully ſerved the intereſt of thoſe in their generation. And this

juſtifies

justifies and warrants us in the pursuit of the *same work*, by the same means, in the same days wherein we live. And when at any time *men sleep* in the neglect of their duty, the envious one will not be wanting to *sow his Tares* in the field of the Lord; which as in the times and places wherein we live it should quicken the *diligence* and *industry* of those upon whom the care of the preservation of the truth is by the providence of God in an especial manner *devolved*, and who have manifold advantages for their encouragement in their undertaking; so also it *gives countenance* even to the meanest endeavours that in sincerity are employed in the same work by others in their more private capacity, amongst which I hope the ensuing brief discourse may with *impartial Readers* find admittance. It is designed in general for the *defence and vindication of the truth*, and that truth which is publickly professed in this Nation, against the *solicitation* of it, and opposition made unto it with more then ordinary vigilancy, and seeming hopes of prevalency, on what grounds I know not. This is done by those of the *Roman Church*, who have given in themselves as *sad an instance* of a degeneracy from the truth as ever the Christian world had experience of, from insensible and almost *imperceptible* entrances into deviations from the holy rule of the Gospel, countenanced by

specious pretences of piety and devotion, but really influenced by the *corrupt lusts* of ambition, love of preheminence, and earthly mindedness, in men ignorant or neglective of the *mystery and simplicity of the Gospel*, their Apostacy hath been carried on by various degrees upon advantages given unto those that made the benefit of it unto themselves, by *political commotions* and alterations, until by sundry artifices and sleights of Sathan and men, it is grown unto that *stated opposition* to the right wayes of God, which we behold it come unto at this day: The great *Roman Historian* desires his *Reader* in the perusal of his discourses to consider and observe, *quæ vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos vires quibusq; artibus domi militiæq; & partum & auctum imperium sit. Labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut dissidentes primo mores sequatur animo; deinde ut magis magisq; lapsi sint, tum ire cæperint præcipites, donec ad hæc tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est*; *What was the course of life, what were the manners of those men both at home and abroad, by whom the Roman Empire was erected and enlarged; as also how antient discipline insensibly decaying, far different manners ensued, whose decay more and more increasing, at length they began violently to decline untill we came unto these dayes wherein we are able to beare neither our vices nor their remedies:*

remedies: All which may be as truly and justly spoken of the *present Roman* Ecclesiastical estate. The first *Rulers* and members of that Church by their exemplary *sanctity and suffering* for the truth, deservedly obtained great renown & reputation amongst the other Churches in the world; but after a while the *discipline of Christ* decaying amongst them, and the purity of his doctrine beginning to be corrupted, they insensibly fell from their pristine glory, untill at length they *precipitantly* tumbled into that condition; wherein because they fear the *spiritual remedy* would be their *temporal ruine*, they are resolved to abide, be it never so desperate or deplorable. And hence also it is, that of all the *opposition* that ever the disciples of Christ had to *contend* withall, to *suffer* under, or to *witness* against, that made unto the truth by the *Roman Church*, hath proved the longest, and been attended with the most dreadful consequents. For it is not the work of *any one Age*, or of a few persons to *unravel* that *web* of falshood and unrighteousness, which in a long tract of time hath been cunningly *woven*, and closely compacted together. Besides the *Heads* of this declension have provided for their security by intermixing their concerns with the *Polity* of many Nations, and moulding the constitutions of their *Governments* unto a subser-

 viency

viency to their interests and ends. But he is *strong and faithful* who in his own way and time will rescue his Truth and Worship from being trampled on and defiled by them. In the mean time that which renders the *errors* of the Fathers and Sons of that Church most pernitious unto the professors of Christianity, is, that whether out of *blind Zeal*, rooted in that obstinacy which men are usually given up unto who have *refused to retain the Truth* in the love and power of it, or from their being necessitated thereunto in their *Councils* for the supportment and preservation of their present interests and secular advantages, they are not contented to *embrace*, practice and adhere unto those *crooked paths* that they have chosen to walk in, and to attempt the drawing of others into them by such wayes and means as the *light of Nature*, right reason, with the Scripture, directs to be used in and about the *things of Religion* which relate to the minds and souls of men, but also they have pursued an imposition of their conceptions and practises on other men by *force* and violence, untill the world in many places hath been made a stage of *oppression, rapine, cruelty and war*, and that which they call their Church, a very *Shambles* of the slaughter'd Disciples of Christ. So that what the *Historian* said of the old *Romans* in reference unto the

the *Gals* or *Cimbrians*; *usq; ad nostram memoriam, Romani alia omnia virtuti sua prona esse, cum Gallis pro salute non pro gloria certari*; we may apply unto them; it is not *Truth* only, but our *Temporal safety* also that we are enforced to contend with them about. And whom they cannot reach with outward *violence*, they endeavour to lade with *curses*, and by precipitate censures and determination to *eject them* out of the limits of Christianity, as to the spiritual and eternal priviledges wherewith it is attended. And these things make all hopes of *Reconciliation* for the future, and of present *moderation* languid and weak, as all endeavours after them hitherto have been fruitless. For whilest they contend that every *proposall of their Church*, every way, and mode, in the worship of God that is in usage amongst them, is not only *true*, and *right*, but of necessity to be embraced and submitted unto, and therefore impose them by all *sorts of penalties* on the consciences and practises of all men, is it not evident that there can be no peace nor agreement in the world but what *waste* and *solitude* arising from an extermination of persons otherwise minded then themselves, will produce? some of them I confess to serve their *present supposed advantages*, have of late declaimed about *moderation* in matters of Religion; and I wish that herein that may

be *ſincerely* indeavoured by ſome, which for ſiniſter ends, is *corruptly* pretended by others. For mine own part, there are no ſort of men from whoſe frame of ſpirit and wayes I ſhall labour a *greater diſtance* then theirs, who ſet themſelves againſt that *moderation* towards perſons differing from them and others in the reſult of their thoughts upon an humble ſincere inveſtigation of the truth and wayes of Chriſt, which himſelf and his Apoſtles commend unto us, or that refuſe to conſent unto *any way of Reconciliation* of diſſenters, wherein violence is not offered unto the *commands* of God, as ſtated in their conſciences. Let the *Romaniſts* renounce their principles about the *abſolute neceſſity* of the ſubjection of all perſons unto the *Pope*, in anſwer unto that groundleſs and boundleſs Authority which in things *ſacred and civil* they aſſign unto him, with their reſolution of impoſing the *dictates* of their Church *per fas & nefas* upon our conſciences, and we ſhall endeavour with all quietneſs and *moderation* to *plead* with them about our remaining differences, and to *joyn* with them in the profeſſion of thoſe important truths wherein we are agreed. But whileſt they propoſe no other forms of *Reconciliation*, but our *abſolute ſubmiſſion* unto their Papal Authority, with our aſſent unto, and profeſſion of thoſe doctrines which we are perſwaded

are

are *contrary* to the Scripture, with the ſenſe of *Catholick Antiquity*, derogatory to the Glory of God, and prejudicial to the ſalvation of thoſe by whom they are received, and our concurrence with them in thoſe *wayes of Religious worſhip*, which themſelves are fallen into by degrees they know not how, & which we believe diſhonourable unto God, and *pernitious* to the ſouls of men, I ſee no ground of any other peace with them, but that only which we are *bound to follow with all men*, in abſtaining from mutual violences, performing all offices of Chriſtian love, and in a ſpecial praying for their *repentance and coming to the acknowledgment of the Truth*. On this account was it, that ſome while ſince upon the deſire of ſome friends, I undertook the *examination* of a diſcourſe entituled *Fiat Lux*, whoſe Author under a pretence of that *moderation*, which is indeed altogether inconſiſtent with other principles of his profeſſion, endeavoured to inſinuate a neceſſity of the *reception of Popery* for the bringing of us to peace or agreement here, and the *intereſting* of us in any hope of eternal reſt and peace hereafter. Whether that *ſmall labour* were ſeaſonable or no, or whether any ſervice were done therein to the intereſt of Truth, is left to the judgement of men unprejudiced. Not long after there was publiſhed an *Epiſtle*, pretending a Reply unto that

diſcourſe, being indeed a meer flouriſh of empty words, and a giving up of the cauſe wherein the Author of *Fiat Lux* was engaged, as *deſperate* and indefenſible. However I thought it not meet to let it paſs without ſome conſideration; partly that the *deſign* of that Treatiſe, with others of the like nature of late publiſhed amongſt us, might be further manifeſted, and partly that the ends of *moderation* and peace being fixed between us, I might farther try and examine, *whoſe*, and what *principles* are beſt ſuited unto their purſuit and accompliſhment. I have not therefore confined my ſelf unto an Anſwer unto the *Epiſtle* of the Author of *Fiat Lux*, which indeed it doth not deſerve, as I ſuppoſe, himſelf being judge; but have only from it taken *occaſion* to diſcuſs thoſe principles and uſages in Religion, wherein the moſt important differences between *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* do lie. For whereas the *whole difference* between them and us, is branched into *two general heads*; the firſt concerning thoſe principles which they and we ſeverally *build* our profeſſion upon, and *reſolve* our faith into; and the other reſpecting *particular inſtances* in doctrines of faith, and practice in Religious worſhip, I have laid hold of occaſion to treat of them both; of the former *abſolutely*, and of the latter in things of moſt *weight* and concernment.

And

And because the *Judgement of Antiquity* is deservedly of moment in these things, I have not only manifested it to lie plain and clear against the *Romanist* in instances sufficient to impeach their *pretended infallibility*, which is enough to dissolve that whole *imaginary fabrick* that is built upon it, and centers in it; but also in most of the *material controversies* that are between them and us. These things Christian Reader, I thought meet to premise towards the *prevention* of that *offence* which any may really take, or for corrupt ends pretend so to do, at the *differences* in *general* that are amongst Christians, or those in *especial* which are between us and the *Roman Church*; as also to give an account of the occasion, design and end of the ensuing consideration of them.

The

THE CONTENTS OF THE CHAPTERS.

CHAP. 1.

AN *Answer to the Preface or Introduction of the Reply to the* Animadversions. page 1.

CHAP. 2.

A Vindication of the first Chapter of the Animadversions. *The method of* Fiat Lux. *Romanists Doctrine of the Merit of Good Works.* p. 27

CHAP. 3.

A defence of the second Chapter of the Animadversions; *Principles of* Fiat Lux *re-examined. Of our receiving of the Gospel from* Rome. *Our abode with them. From whom we received it.* p. 37

CHAP. 4.

Further Vindication of the first Chapter of the Animadversions: *Church of* Rome *not what she was of old. Her Fall and Apostacy. Difference between Idolatry, Apostacy and Heresie. Schism. Principles of*

of the Church of Rome *condemned by the antient Church-Fathers, and Councils. Imposing Rites unnecessary. Persecution for Conscience. Papal Supremacy. The Branches of it. Papal Personal Infallibility. Religious Veneration of Images.* p.48

CHAP. 5.

The Principles of Fiat Lux *re-examined. Things not at quiet in Religion before Reformation of the first Reformers. Departure from* Rome, *no Cause of Divisions. Returnal unto* Rome, *no means of Union.* p. 89

CHAP. 6.

Further Vindication of the second Chapter of the Animadversions. *Scripture sufficient to settle men in the Truth. Instance against it, examined, removed; Principles of Protestants and Romanists in reference unto Moderation, compared and discussed.* p. 99

CHAP. 7.

Unity of Faith wherein consists. Principles of Protestants as to the setling men in Religion and Unity of Faith, proposed and confirmed. p. 121

CHAP. 8.

Principles of Papists whereon they proceed in bringing men to a setlement in Religion, and the Unity of Faith; examined. p. 161

CHAP. 9.

Proposals from Protestant Principles tending unto Moderation and Unity. p. 204

CHAP. 10.

Further Vindication of the second Chapter of the Animadversions; *The remaining Principles of* Fiat Lux *considered.* p. 301

CHAP. 11.

Judicious Readers. Schoolmen the Forgers of Popery. [illegible] Discourse in Fiat Lux. p. 308

CHAP.

CHAP. 12.

False Suppositions causing false and absurd consequences. Whence we had the Gospel in England, *and by whose means. What is our Duty in reference unto them by whom we receive the Gospel.* p. 315

CHAP. 13.

Faith and Charity of the Roman Catholicks. p. 351

CHAP. 14.

Of Reason. Jews objections against Christ. p. 362

CHAP. 15.

Pleas of Prelate Protestants. Christ the only supream and absolute Head of the Church. p. 370

CHAP. 16.

The Power assigned by Papists and Protestants unto Kings in matters Ecclesiastical. Their several Principles discussed and compared. p. 398

CHAP. 17.

Scripture. Story of the Progress and declension of Religion vindicated. Papal Artifices for the promotion of their Power and Interest. Advantages made by them on the Western Empire. p. 423

CHAP. 18.

Reformation of Religion. Papal contradictions. Ejice ancillam. p. 447

CHAP. 19.

Of preaching the Mass: And the Sacrifice of it Transubstantiation. Service of the Church. p. 452

CHAP. 20.

Of the Blessed Virgin. p. 470

CHAP. 21.

Images. Doctrine of the Council of Trent. *Of the second* Nicene. *The Arguments for the Adoration of Images. Doctrine of the antient Church. Of the chief Doctrine of the Roman Church. Practice of the whole. Vain foundations of the pretences*

pretences for Image Worſhip examined and reproved. P.477

CHAP. 22.

Of the Latine Service: P.526

CHAP. 23.

Communion. P.558

CHAP. 24.

Heroes. Of the Aſſes Head, whoſe worſhip was objected to Jews and Chriſtians. P.559

ERRATA.

ERRATA.

PAge 2. l. 13. r. *cæterarum* : p. 3. l. 23. r. *advantage* : p. 4. l. 1. r. *ultio* : l. 2. r. *nocens* : p. 5. l. 16. r. ἦν : p. 7. l. 5. r. τὴν : p. 11. l. 1. r. *Crescens* : p. 12. l. 16. r. *you have neither* : p. 15. l. 1. r. *pleadable* : p. 16. l. 11. r. ἂν : l. 29. r. *parcas* : p. 67. l. 22. r. *that* : p. 69. l. 5. r. *what* : p. 71. l. 26. r. *revengeth* : p. 75. l. 15. r. *tumbled* : p. 76. l. 22. r. *Lybya* : p. 77. l. 24. r. ἔθος : p. 82. l. 10. r. ἐπαυτοσώρω : p. 84. l. 1. r. *pseudopigraphall* : p. 85. l. 30. r. *Tharasius* : p. 87. l. 12. r. *Demetriad* : l. 31. r. φαλσογρα : p. 91. l. 8. r. σιωπή : p. 105. l. 30. r. *from* : p. 106. l. 27. r. *feat* : l. 34. after *that*, add *they* : p. 117. l. 33. r. *indispeasible* : p. 119. l. 9. r. *Bogomilus* : p. 127. l. 5. r. *infallibly* : p. 132. l. 14. r. *the* : p. 139. l. 28. r. *produce* : p. 144. l. 6. r. *generi* : l. 32. r. *utiq;* : p. 145. l. 34. r. ἀναγκαῖς : p. 152. l. 8. dele *it* : p. 335. l. 7. r. *retritius* : p. 337. l. 4. r. *superstitious* : p. 343. l. 14. r. *ipse* : p. 353. l. 1. r. *quoi* : p. 355. l. 8. r. *your Church* : p. 357. l. 31. r. *homines* : p. 359. l. 3. r. *Brentius* : p. 375. l. 3. r. *your* : p. 383. l. 13. r. *the Church* : l. 14. r. *affect it* : p. 389. l. 29. r. *preside* : p. 393. l. 14. r. *to* : p. 396. l. 12. r. *preside* : p. 410. l. 24. r. *whereas* : p. 417. l. 32. r. *Panoruitanus* ; p. 419. l. 16. r. *with* : p. 420. l. 7. r. *He* : l. 8. r. *the* p. 439. l. 8. r. *with* : p. 441. l. 22. r. *nor* : p. 455. l. 16. add *part.* *corr.*

In divers places the Copy was mistaken [*the Church*] is Printed instead of [*our Church*:] the intelligent Reader may easily see the mistake, and do the Author right therein.

A

A Vindication of the Animadversions on Fiat Lux.

CHAP. I.

SIR,

I Have received your *Epistle*, and therein your excuse for your long silence, which I willingly admit of; and could have been contented it had been longer, so that you had been advantaged thereby to have spoken any thing more to the purpose, than I find you have now done: *Sat citò si sat benè:* Things of this nature, are alwayes done *soon* enough, when they are done *well* enough, or as well as they are capeable of being done. But it is no small disappointment to find ἄνθρακας ἀντὶ τοῦ θησαυροῦ, a fruitless flourish of words, where a serious debate of an important cause was expected and looked for. Nor is it a justification of any man, when he has done a thing *amiss*, to say he did it *speedily*, if he were no way necessitated so to do. You are engaged in a Cause, unto whose tolerable defence, *opus est Zephyris & hirundine multa:* though you cannot pretend so short a time to be used in it, which will not by many be esteemed more than it deserves; for all time and pains taken to give countenance to errour is undoubtedly mispent; οὐ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας. saith the great Apostle; *We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth:* which Rule had you observed, you might have spared your whole time and labour in this business. However I shall be glad to find that you have given me just cause to believe what you say, of your *not seeing the Animadversions on your Book before February.* As I

find you observant of Truth in your Progress, or failing therein, so shall I judg of your veracity in this unlikely story; for every man gives the best measure of himself. And though I cannot see how possibly a man could spend much time in trussing up such a *fardle* of *trifles* and *quibbles* as your *Epistle* is, yet it is somewhat strange on the other side, that you should not in eight moneths space, for so long were the *Animadversions* made publick before *February*, set eye on that, which being your own especiall concernment, was to my knowledg in the hands of many of your party. To deal friendly with you, *nolim caterarum rerum te secordem eodem modo.* Yea I doubt not but you use more diligence in your other affairs; though in generall the matter in debate between us seems to be your Principall concernment. But now you have seen that *Discourse*, and as you inform me *have read it over*; which I believe, and take not only upon the same score of present Trust, but upon the *Evidance* also which you give unto your Assertion, by your carefull avoiding to take any further notice of the things that you found too difficult for you to reply unto: For any impartiall *Reader*, that shall seriously consider the *Animadversions* with your *Epistle*, will quickly find, that the main *Artifice* wherein you confide, is a pretence of saying somewhat in general, whilst you pass over the things of most importance, and which most press the cause you defend, with a perpetuall silence: These you turn from, and fall upon the Person of the Author of the *Animadversions*. If ever you debated this procedure with your self, had I been present with you when you said with him in the Poet, *Dubius sum quid faciam---Tene relinquam an rem*, I should have replied with him, *me sodes*; but you were o-

therwise

therwise minded, and are gone before *Ego, ut contendere durum est.*

Cum victore, sequar. I will follow you with what patience I can, and make the best use I am able of what offers its self in your Discourse.

Two Reasons I confess you adde why you chose *vadimonium deserere*, and not reply to the *Animadversions*; which to deal plainly with you, give me very little satisfaction: The first of them you say, is *because to do so, would be contrary to the very end and design of Fiat Lux*, which shall immediately be considered. The other is, *the threats which I have given you, that if you dare to write again, I will make you know, what manner of man I am.* Sr, Though it seems you *dare not reply* to my Book, yet you dare do that which is much worse; you dare write *palpable untruths*, and such as your self know to be so, as others also who have read those Papers. By such things as these, with sober and ingenious Persons, you cannot but much prejudice the *interest* you desire to promote, as well as in your self you wrong your *conscience*, and ruine your *reputation*. Besides all advantage springing from untruth is fading: neither will it admit of any covering, but of its own kind, which can never be so encreased, but that it will rain through. Only I confess thus far you have promoted your design, that you have given a new and cogent instance of *the Evils attending Controversies in Religion*, which you declame about in your *Fiat*; which yet is such, as it had been your duty to avoid. What it is that you make use of to give countenance unto this fiction (for *malum semper habitat in alieno fundo*) I shall have occasion afterwards to consider. For the present I leave you to the discipline of your own thoughts;

Prima est hæc ultio quod se
Judice, nemo nocens absolvitur.

And I the rather mind you of your *failure* at this entrance of our discourse, that I may only remit your thoughts unto this stricture, when the like occasion offers it self, which I fear it will do not unfrequently: But Sr, it will be no advantage unto mee, or you, to contend for the Truth which we profess, if in the mean time, we are regardless of the observance of truth, in our own hearts and spirits.

Two Principall Heads, the Discourse which you premise unto the Particular consideration of the Animadversions, is reducible unto: The first whereof is, your endeavour to manifest, *that I understood not the design and end of* Fiat Lux, *a Discourse* (as you modestly testifie) *hard to deal with, and impossible to confute.* The other, your Enquiry after the Author of the *Animadversions*, with your attempt to prove him one in *such a condition*, as you may possible hope to obtain more advantage from, than you can do by endeavouring the refutation of his Book. Some other occasionall passages there are in it also, which as they deserve, shall be considered. Unto these two Generall Heads I shall give you at present a Candid Return, and leave you when you are *free from Flies* to make what use of it you please.

The *Design* of *Fiat Lux*, I took to be the promotion of the *Papall Interest*; and the whole of it, in the relation of its parts unto one another, and the generall End aimed at in it, to be a perswasive induction unto the embracement of the present *Romane* Faith and Religion. The means insisted on for this end, I conceived principally to be these; 1. A declaration of the evils that attend differences in Religion, and disputes about it: 2. Of the good of Union,

Peace,

Peace, Love, and Concord among Christians: 3. Of the impossibility of obtaining this good by any other wayes or means, but only by an embracement of the *Roman* Catholick Faith and Profession, with a submission to the deciding Power and Authority of the Pope, or your Church: 4. A defence and illustration of some especiall parts of the *Roman* Religion, most commonly by Protestants excepted against. This was my *mistake*; unto this *mistake* I acknowledge my whole discourse was suited. In the same *mistake* are all the persons in *England*, that ever I heard speak any thing of that discourse, of what perswasion in Religion soever they were. And *Aristotle* thought it worth while to remember out of *Hesiod. Moral. Nicom. lib.7.* that

> Φήμη δ' ἔν τοί γε πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται ἔν τινα λαοὶ
> Πολλοὶ φημίζουσιν.

That report which so many consent in, is not altogether vain. But yet least this should not satisfie you, I shall mind you of one who is with you, πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄνθρων, of as much esteem it may be as all the rest, and that is *your self*; you are your self in the same *mistake*: you know well enough that this was your End, this your Designe, these the means of your persuing it; and you acknowledge them immediately so to have been, as we shall see in the consideration of the evidence you tender to evince that *mistake* in me which you surmize.

First you tell me, *pag.* 4. *That I mistake the drift and design of* Fiat Lux, *whilest I take that as absolutely spoken, which is only said upon an Hypothesis of our present condition here in* England. This were a grand mistake indeed, that I should look on any thing proposed as an Expedient for the ending of Differences about Religion, without a supposition of Dif-

ferences about Religion. But how do you prove that I fell into such *a mistake?* I plainly and openly acknowledge that such differences there are; all my discourse proceeds on that supposition. I bewaile the *evil* of them, and labour for *moderation* about them; and have long since ventured to propose my thoughts unto the world, to that purpose. All that you *suppose* in your Discourse on this account I *suppose* also; yea and grant it, unless it be some such thing as is in *controversie* between you and Protestants, which you are somewhat frequent in the *supposall* of unto your Advantage; and thereon would perswade them unto a relinquishment of *Protestancy*, and embracement of *Popery*, which is the end of your Book, and will be thought so, if you should deny it a thousand times: For *quid ego verba audiam facta cum video?* your *Protestation* comes too late, when the *fact* hath declared your mind: neither are you now at liberty to coyn new designes for your *Fiat*. But this must be my *mistake*, which no man in his wits could possibly fall into; neither is it an evidence of any great sobriety to impute it to any man, whom we know not certainly to be distracted. But this mistake you tell me, caused me *to judge and censure what you wrote, as impertinent, impious, frivolous, &c.* No such matter; my right apprehention of your *hypothesis*, End, or Designe, occasioned me to shew, that your discourses were incompetent to prevail with rationall and sober Persons, to comply with your desires.

You proceed to the same purpose *pag.* 15. and to manifest my mistake of your designe, give an account of it, and tell us, that *one thing you suppose, namely, that We are at difference.* So did I also, and am not therefore yet fallen upon the discovery of my mistake. 2. You *command Peace*, I acknowledge you do,

do, and joyn with you therein, neither is he worthy the name of a Christian, who is otherwise minded; that is one great Legacy that Christ bequeathed unto his Disciples; Εἰρήνην, saith he ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν. *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you.* And he is no Disciple of Christ who doth not long for it, among all his Disciples. *This* you tell us is the *whole summe of* Fiat Lux *in few words.* You will tell us otherwise immediately; and if you should not, yet we should find it otherwise. You adde therefore, *that to introduce a disposition unto peace, you made it your work to demonstrate the uselesness, endlesness, and unprofitableness of Quarrels*: yet my *mistake* appears not; I perceived you did speak to this purpose; and I acknowledge with you, that *Quarrels* about Religion are useless and unprofitable, any otherwise than as we are bound to *contend earnestly for the faith once delivered unto the Saints*, and to *stand fast in our Liberty, not giving place to seducers*, with labouring by *sound doctrine to convince and stop the mouthes of gainsayers*; all which are made necessary unto us by the commands of Christ, and are not to be called quarreling. And I know that our *Quarrels* are not yet *actually ended*; that they are *endless*, I believe not, but hope the contrary. You proceed and grant, that *you labour to perswade your Countreymen of an Impossibility of ever bringing our debates unto a conclusion; either by Light, or Spirit, or Reason, or Scripture, so long as we stand separated from any superiour Judicative Power, unto which all Parties will submit, and therefore that it is rationall and Christian like, to leave these endless contentions, and resigne our selves to humility and peace.* This matter will now quickly be ended, and that *ex ore tuo*; give me leave I pray to ask you one

or two plain Questions: 1. Whom do you understand by that *Superiour Judicative Power*, unto whom you perswade all Parties to submit? Have you not told us in your *Fiat* that it is the Church or Pope of *Rome*? or will you deny that to be your intention? 2. What do you intend by *resigning our selves to humility and Peace*? Do you not ayme at our quiet submission to the determinations of the Church or Pope in all matters of Religion? Have you not declared your self unto this purpose in your *Fiat*? And I desire a little further to know of you, whither this be not that which *formally* constitutes a mana member of your Church, that he own the Judicative Power of the Pope or your Church in all matters of Religion, and submit himself thereunto? If these things be so, as you cannot deny them, I hope I shall easily obtain your pardon, for Affirming that you your self believed the same to be the design of your Book, which I and other men apprehended to be so; for here you directly avow it. If you complain any more about this matter, pray let it be in the words of him in the Comœdian, *Egomet meo judicio miser quasi sorex hodie perii*, This inconvenience you have brought upon your own self: Neither can any man long avoid such misadventures, who designs to cloud his aymes, which yet cannot take effect, if not in some measure understood. Naked Truth mannaged in sincerity, whatever perplexities it may meet with-all, will never leave its owners in the bryars; whereas the Serpentine turnings of Errour and falshood to extricate themselves, do but the more entangle their Promoters. I doubt not, but you hope well, that when all are become Papists again, that they shall live at peace, though your hope be very groundless as I have elsewhere demonstrated. You have at best

but

but the shadow or shell of peace, and for the most part, not that neither. Yea it may be easily shewed, that the peace you boast of, is inconsistent with, and destructive of that peace, which is left by Christ unto his Disciples.

But the way you propose to bring us to Peace, is the embracement of *Popery*, which is that, that was fixed on by me, as the design of your Book, which now acknowledging, you have disarmed your self of that imaginary advantage, which you flourish withall, from a *Capitall Mistake*, as you call it in me, in misapprehending your design. You were told before, that if by *Moderation* and *Peace*, you intended a mutuall forbearance of one another, in our severall perswasions, waiting patiently untill God shall reveal unto us the precise Truth, in the things about which we differ, you shall have all the furtherance that I can contribute unto you; but you have another aim, another work in hand, and will not allow that any Peace is attainable amongst us, but by a resignation of all our Apprehensions in matters of Religion, to the guidance, determination, and decision of the Pope, or your Church, a way no where prescribed unto us in holy Writ, nor in the *Councels of the Primitive Church*, and besides against all Reason, Law, and Equity, your Pope and Church in our Contests being one Party litigant; yet *in this perswasion*, you say, *you should abide, were there no other persons in the world but your self that did embrace it.* And to let you see how unlikely that Principle is to produce Peace and Agreement, amongst those multitudes that are at variance about these things, I can assure you, that if there were none left alive in the Earth but you and I, we should not agree in this thing one jot better, than did *Cain* and *Abel* about the Sacrifices;

ces; though I should desire you, that we might manage our differences with more moderation, than he did, who by vertue of his *Primogeniture*, seemed to lay a speciall claim to the *Priesthood*. And indeed for your part, if your present perswasion be, as you sometimes pretend it to be, that your *Fiat Lux* is not a perswasive unto Popery, you have given a sufficient testimony, that you can be of an opinion, that no man else in the world is of, nor will be, do what you can. But the insufficiency of your Principles and Arguments, to accomplish your design, hath been in part already evinced, and shall, God willing, in our progress, be further made manifest. This is the summe of what appears in the first part of your prefatory discourse, concerning my mistake of your design, which how little it hath tended unto your advantage, I hope you begin to understand.

Your next labour consists in a pacifick, charitable Enquiry, after the *Author of the Animadversions*, with an endeavour by I know not how many Reasons, to confirm your surmize, that he is a Person, that had an interest in the late troubles in the Nation, or as you phrase it, was a *part of that dismall tempest, which overbore all before it, not only Church and State, but Reason, Right, Honesty, all true Religion, and even good Nature too.* See what despair of managing an undertaking which cannot well be deserted, will drive men unto. Are you not sensible that you cry,

——— *Vos ô mihi manes.*
Este boni, quoniam Superis aversa voluntas.

Or like the Jews, who when they were convinced of their errours, and wickedness, by our Saviour, began to call him *Samaritane*, and *Devil*, and to take up

up stones to cast at him: Or as *Crescens* the *Cynick* dealt with *Justin Martyr*, whom because he could not answer, after he had engaged in a dispute with him, he laboured to bring him into suspition with the Emperour, and Senate of *Rome*, as a person dangerous to the Commonwealth: And so also the *Arians* dealt with *Athanasius*. It were easie to manifest, that the spring of all this discourse of yours, is *smart*, and not *Loyalty*, and that it proceeds from a sense of your own disappointment, and not zeal for the welfare of others; but how little it is to your purpose, I shall shew you anon, and could quickly render it as little to your advantage: For what if I should surmize, that you were one of the *Friers*, that stirred up the *Irish* to their rebellion, and unparralleld murthers? Assure your self, I can quickly give as many, and as probable Reasons for my so doing, as you have given, or can give for your conjecture, about the *Author of the Animadversions*, on your *Fiat Lux*. You little think how much it concerns him to look to himself, who undertakes to accuse another; and how easie it were to make you repent your accusation, as much as ever *Crassus* did his accusing of *Carbo*. But I was in good hope, you would have left such reflections, as are capable of so easie a retortion upon your self, especially being irregular, and no way subservient unto your design, and being warned beforehand so to do. Who could imagine, that a man of so much *piety*, and *mortification*, as in your *Fiat* you profess your self to be, should have so little regard unto common honesty, and civility, which are shrewdly entrenched upon by such uncharitable *surmizes*? I suppose you know that the Apostle reckons, ἐπίσκοπος πονηρὸς, whereof you have undertaken the management of one, amongst the things that

that are contrary to the Doctrine, that is according unto godliness; otherwise suspicion is in your own power, nor can any man hinder you from surmizing what you please. This he knew in *Plautus*, who cryed,

Ne admittam culpam ego meo sum promus pectori,
Suspicio est in pectore alieno sita.
Nam nunc ego te si surripuisse suspicer,
Jovi coronam de capite e Capitolio,
Quod in culmine est at summo, si non id feceris,
Atq; id tamen mihi lubeat suspicarier,
Qui tu id prohibere me potes ne suspicer?

And I know that concerning all your dispute and arguings in these Pages, you may say what *Lucian* doth about his true Story, γεγραφα τοινυν περι ὧν μητ' ἰδον, μητ' ἐπαθον, μητε παρ' ἄλλων ἐπυθομην. *You write* about the things, which *have neither been seen*, nor *suffered, heard*, nor *much enquired after*; such is the force of faction, and sweetness of revenge in carnall minds. To deliver you if it may be from the like miscarriages for the future, let me inform you, that the Author of the *Animadversions*, is a Person, who never had a hand in, nor gave consent unto the raising of any War in these Nations, nor unto any politicall alteration in them, no not to any one that was amongst us during our Revolutions; but he acknowledgeth that he lived and acted under them, the things wherein he thought his duty consisted, and challengeth all men to charge him with doing the least personall injury unto any, professing himself ready to give satisfaction to any one, that can justly claim it. Therefore as unto the publick affairs in this Nation, he is amongst them who bless God and the King for the Act of Oblivion, and that because he

he ſuppoſeth, that all the Inhabitants of the Kingdome which lived in it, when his Majeſty was driven out of it, have cauſe ſo to do, which ſome Prieſts and Friers have, and that in reference unto ſuch actings, as he would ſcorn for the ſaving of his life, to give the leaſt countenance unto, among whom it is not unlikely that you might be one, which yet he will not averre, nor give Reaſons to prove it, becauſe he doth not know it ſo to be. But you have ſundry Reaſons to juſtifie your ſelf in your Charge, and they are as well worthy our conſideration, as any thing elſe you have written in your *Epiſtle*, and ſhall therefore not be neglected. The firſt of them you thus expreſs, *pag.* 12. *You cannot abide to hear of Moderation, it is with you moſt wicked, hypocriticall, and diveliſh, eſpecially as it comes from me; for this one thing* Fiat Lux *ſuffers more from you, than for all the Contents of the Book put together. My reaſon is your paſſion, my moderation enflames your wrath, and you are therefore ſtark wilde, becauſe I utter ſo much of ſobriety.* This is your firſt Reaſon, which you have exactly ſquared to the old Rule, *Calumpiare fortiter, aliquid adhærebit:* Calumny will leave a ſcar; would you were your ſelf only concerned in theſe things. But among the many wofull miſcarriages, of men profeſſing the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby the beauty and glory of it have been ſtained in the world, and it ſelf in a great meaſure rendred ineffectuall unto its bleſſed ends, there is not any thing of more ſad conſideration, than the endeavours of men to promote and propagate the things, which they ſuppoſe belong unto it, by wayes and means directly contrary unto, and deſtructive of its moſt known and fundamentall Principles. For when it is once obſerved and manifeſt, that the actings of men in the promoti-

on

on of any Religion, are forbidden and condemned in that Religion which they seek to promote, what can rationally be concluded, but that they not only disbelieve themselves what they outwardly profess, but also esteem it a fit mask and cover to carry on other interests of their own, which they prefer before it? and what can more evidently tend unto its disreputation and disadvantage, is not easie to conceive. Such is the course here fixed on by you: It is the Religion of Christ you pretend to plead for, and to promote, but if there be a word true in it, the way you take for that end, namely by openly false accusations, is to be abhorred, which manifests what regard unto it you inwardly cherish. And I wish this were only your *personall miscarriage*, that you were not encouraged unto it, by the Principles and Example of your chiefest Masters and Leaders: The learned Person who wrote the Letters, discovering the *Mystery of Jesuitisme*, gives us just cause so to conceive; for he doth not only prove, that the *Jesuits* have publickly maintained, that *Calumny is but a veniall sin*, nay none at all, if used against such as you call Calumniators, though grounded on *absolute falsities*, but hath also given us such pestilent instances of their practice, according to that Principle, as *Paganisme* was never acquainted withall, *Lett.* 15. In their steps you set out in this your first Reason, wherein there is not one word of truth. I had formerly told you, that I did not think you could your self believe some of the things that you affirmed, at which you take great offence; but I must now tell you, that if you proceed in venting such notorious untruths, as here you have heaped together, I shall greatly question whether seriously you believe, that Jesus Christ will one day judge the world in righte-

ousnes;

ouſneſs: For I do not think you can produce a pleadable diſpenſation, to ſay what you pleaſe, be it nere ſo falſe, of a ſuppoſed Heretick; for though it may be you will not keep faith with him, ſurely you ought to obſerve truth in ſpeaking of him. You tell us in your Epiſtle to your *Fiat*, of your *darke obſcurity, wherein you dye daily*, but take heed Sr, leaſt

——— *Indulgentem tenebris imaq; receſſu*
Sedis, in aſpectos Cœlo radiiſq; Penates
Servantem, tamen aſſiduis circumvolet ala
Sæva dies animi, ſcelerumq; in pectore dira.

Your next Reaſon is, *Becauſe he talks of Swords and Blood, Fire and Fagot, Guns and Daggers, which doth more than ſhow, that he hath not let go thoſe hot and furious imaginations.* But of what ſort, by whom uſed, to what end? Doth he mention any of theſe, but ſuch as your Church hath made uſe of, for the deſtruction of Proteſtants? If you have not done ſo, why do you not diſprove his Aſſertions? If you have, why have you practiſed that in the face of the Sun, which you cannot endure to be told of? Is it equall think you, that you ſhould kill, burn, and deſtroy men, for the profeſſion of their faith in Chriſt Jeſus, and that it ſhould not be lawfull for others to ſay you do ſo? Did not your ſelf make the calling over of theſe things neceſſary, by crying out againſt Proteſtants, for *Want of moderation?* It is one of the priviledges of the Pope, ſome ſay, *to judge all men, and himſelf to be judged by none*; but is it ſo alſo, that no man may ſay he hath done, what all the world knows he hath done, and which we have juſt cauſe to fear he would do again, had he power to his will? For my part I can aſſure you, ſo that you will ceaſe from charging others, with that whoſe

guilt

guilt lyes heavier upon your selves, than on all the professors of Christianity in the world besides, and give any tolerable security against the like practices for the future, I shall be well content that all which is past, may be put by us poor worms into perpetuall oblivion, though I know it will be called over another day. Untill this be done, and you leave off to make your advantages of other mens miscarriages, pray arm your selves with patience, to hear sometimes a little of your own.

Ὁππόιον κ' εἴπηθα ἔπος, τοῖον ἀν ἐπακούσαις.

said wise *Homer* of old; and another to the same purpose, *He that speaks what he will, must hear what he would not.* Is it actionable with you against a Protestant, that he will not take your whole Sword into his bowels, without complaining? Sr, the Author of the *Animadversions* doth, and ever did abhorre Swords and Guns, and *Crusadoes*, in matters of Religion and Conscience, with all violence, that may tantamount unto their usuall effects. He ever thought it an uncouth sight, to see men marching with *Crosses* on their backs, to destroy Christians, as if they had the *Alcoran* in their hearts; and therefore desires your excuse, if he have reflected a little upon the miscarriages of your Church in that kind, especially being called thereunto by your present contrary pretences.

Quis tulerit Graculos de seditione querentes? and *Major tandem porcas insane minori.*

It were well if your wayes did no more please you, in the previous prospect you take of them, than they seem to do in a subsequent reflection upon them: But this is the nature of evil, it never comes and goes

goes with the ſame appearing countenance; not that it ſelf changeth at any time, for that which is morally evil is alwayes ſo, but mens apprehenſions variouſly influenced by their affections, luſts, and intereſts, do frequently change and alter. Now what Concluſion can be made from the premiſes rightly ſtated, I leave to your own judgement, at your better leaſure.

Thirdly, You adde, *Your prophetick aſſurance ſo often inculcated, that if you could but once come to whiſper me in the ear, I would plainly acknowledge, either that I underſtand not my ſelf what I ſay, or if I do, believe it not, gives a fair character of theſe fanatick times, wherein ignorance and hypocriſie prevail'd over worth and truth, whereof if your ſelf were any part, it is no wonder you ſhould think, that I or any man elſe ſhould either ſpeak he knows not what, or believe not what himſelf ſpeaks.* That is, a man muſt needs be as bad as you can imagine him, if he have not ſuch an high opinion of your ability and integrity, as to believe that you have written about nothing, but what you perfectly underſtand, nor aſſert any thing in the perſuit of your deſign and intereſt, but what you really and in cold blood believe to be true. All men it ſeems that were no part of the *former diſmall tempeſt*, have this opinion of you; *Credat Apella*: If it be ſo, I confeſs for my part, I have no relief againſt being concluded to be whatever you pleaſe; *Sofia* or not *Sofia*, the Law is in your own hands, and you may condemn all that adore you not into *Fanaticiſme* at your pleaſure; but as he ſaid, *Obſecro per pacem liceat te alloqui, ut ne vapulem*; if you will but grant a little *truce* from this ſeverity, I doubt not but in a ſhort time to take off from your keenneſs, in the management of this Charge: For-

I hope you will allow that a man may ſpeak the truth, without being a *Fanatick*; truth may get hatred, I ſee it hath done ſo, but it will make no man hateſull. Without looking back then to your *Fiat Lux*, I ſhall out of this very *Epiſtle*, give you to ſee, that you have certainly failed on the one hand, in writing about things which you do not at all underſtand, and therefore diſcourſe concerning them, like a blind man about colours; and as I fear greatly alſo on the other; for I cannot ſuppoſe you ſo ignorant, as not to know that ſome things in your diſcourſe, are otherwiſe than by you repreſented: Nay and we ſhall find you at expreſs contradictions, which pretend what you pleaſe, I know you cannot at the ſame time believe. Inſtances of theſe things you will be minded of in our progreſs: Now I muſt needs be very unhappy in diſcourſing of them, if this be *Logick* and *Law*, that for ſo doing, I muſt be concluded a *Fanatick*.

Fourthly, You adde, *Your pert Aſſertion ſo oft occurring in your Book, that there is neither reaſon, truth, nor honeſty in my words, is but the overflowings of that former intemperate zeal*; whereunto may be added, what in the laſt place you inſiſt on to the ſame purpoſe, *namely*, that I *charge you with fraud, ignorance, and wickedneſs, when in my own heart I find you meſt clear from any ſuch blemiſh.* I do not remember where any of thoſe expreſſions are uſed by me; that they are no where uſed thus altogether, I know well enough, neither ſhall I make any enquiry after them. I ſhall therefore deſire you only to produce the inſtances, whereunto any of the cenſures intimated are annexed, and if I do not prove evidently and plainly, that to be wanting in your diſcourſe, which is charged ſo to be, I will make you a

publick

publick acknowledgement of the wrong I have done you. But if no more was by me expreſſed, than your words as uſed to your purpoſe did juſtly deſerve, pray be pleaſed to take notice that it is lawfull for any man to ſpeak the truth: And for my part, ἐγὼ γὰρ ὁ χωρικὸς εἰμι, ἄγροικος εἰμι τὸν σκάφην λέγων, as he ſaid in *Lucian*, I live in the Countrey, where they call a *Spade* a *Spade*. And if you can give any one inſtance, where I have charged you with any *failure*, where there is the leaſt probability that I had in my heart other thoughts, concerning what you ſaid, I will give up my whole intereſt in this cauſe unto you; *Mala mens, malus animus*. You have manifeſted your conſcience to be no juſt meaſure of other mens, who reckon upon their giving an account of what they do or ſay: So that you have but little advanced your Charge, by theſe undue inſinuations.

Neither have you any better ſucceſs, in that which in the next place you inſiſt upon, which yet were it not like the moſt of the reſt, deſtitute of truth, would give more countenance unto your reflection, than them all. It is, that *I give you ſharp and frequent menaces, that if you write or ſpeak again, you ſhall hear more, find more, feel more, more to your ſmart, more than you imagine, more than you would, which reliſh much of that inſulting humour which the Land groaned under.* I ſuppoſe no man reads this repreſentation of my words, with the addition of your own, which makes up the greateſt part of them, but muſt needs think, that you have been ſorely threatned with ſome perſonall inconveniencies, which I would cauſe to befall you, did you not ſurceaſe from writing; or that I would obtain ſome courſe to be taken with you to your prejudice. Now

this must needs savour of the spirit of our late dayes of trouble and mischief, or at least of the former dayes of the prevalency of *Popery* amongst us, when men were not wont in such cases, to take up at bare threats and menaces. If this be so, all men that know the *Author* of the *Animadversions*, and his condition, must needs conclude him to be very *foolish* and *wicked*; *foolish*, for threatning any with that, which is as far from his power to execute, as the person threatned can possibly desire it to be; *wicked*, for designing that evil unto any individuall person, which he abhorres *in hypothesi* to be inflicted on any upon the like account. But what if there be nothing of all this in the pretended menaces? What if the worst that is in them, be only part of a desire, that you would abstain from insisting on the personall miscarriages, of some that profess the Protestant Religion, lest he should be necessitated to make a diversion of your Charge, or to shew the insufficiency of it to your purpose, by recounting the more notorious failings of the Guides, Heads, and Leaders of your Church? If this be so, as it is in truth the whole intendment of any of those expressions that are used by me, (for the most part of them are your own figments) whereever they occurre, what Conclusion can any rationall man make from them? Do they not rather intimate a desire of the use of moderation in these our contests, and an abstinence from things personall, (for which cause also (fruitlessly as I now perceive, by this your new kind of ingenuity and moderation) I prefixed not my Name to the *Animadversions*, which you also take notice of) than any evil intention or design. This was my threatning you; to which now I shall adde, that though I may not say of these Papers, what *Catullus* did

did of his Verses on *Rufus*,

Verum id non impunè feceres, nam te omnia secla
Noscent, & qui sis fama loquitur anus.

Yet I shall say, that as many as take notice of this discourse, will do no less of your disingenuity and manifold falshood, in your vain attempt to relieve your dying Cause, by casting *odium* upon him with whom you have to do; like the *Bonassus* that *Aristotle* informs us of *Hist. Animal. lib. 9. cap. 24.* which being as big as a *Bull*, but having horns turned inward and unusefull for fight, when he is persued, casts out his excrements to defile his persuers, and to stay them in their passage.

But what now is the End in all this heap of things which you would have mistaken for Reasons, that you aym at? it is all to shew how unfit I am to defend the Protestant Religion, and that *I am not such a Protestant as I would be thought to be.* But why so? I embrace the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as declared in the 29 *Articles*, and other approved publick writings, of the most famous Bishops and other Divines thereof. I avow her rejection of the *pretended* Authority, and *reall* Errours of the Church, to be her duty and justifiable. The same is my judgment in reference unto all other Protestant Churches in the world, in all things wherein they agree among themselves, which is in all things necessary that God may be acceptably worshipped, and themselves saved. And why may I not plead the Cause of Protestancy, against that imputation of demerit which you heap upon it? Neither would I *be thought* to be any thing in Religion but what I am: Neither have I any sentiments therein, but what I profess. But it may be you will say in some things I differ

from other Proteſtants: wiſely obſerved; and if from thence you can conclude a man unqualified for the defency of Proteſtancy, you have ſecured your ſelf from oppoſition; ſeeing every Proteſtant doth ſo, and muſt do ſo whileſt there are differences amongſt Proteſtants: But they are in things wherein their Proteſtancy is not concerned. And may I be ſo bold as to ask you, how the caſe in this inſtance ſtands with your ſelf, who certainly would have your competency for the defence of your Church unqueſtionable? Differences there are amongſt you; and that as in and about other things, ſo alſo about the Pope himſelf, the head and ſpring of the Religion you profeſs. Some of you maintain his *Perſonall Infallibility*, and that not only in *matters of Faith*, but in *matters of Fact* alſo. Others diſclaim the former as highly erroneous, and the latter as groſly blaſphemous. Pray what is your judgment in this matter, for I ſuppoſe you are not of both theſe opinions at once, and I am ſure they are irreconcileable. Some of you mount his *Supremacy* above a Generall Councill, ſome would bring him into a Coordination with it, and ſome ſubject him unto it; though he hath almoſt carried the Cauſe, by having ſtore of *Biſhopricks* to beſtow, whereas a Councill has none, which was the Reaſon given of old for his prevalency in this Conteſt. May we know what you think in this Caſe? Some of you aſſert him to be *de jure* Lord of the whole world in *Spirituals* and *Temporals* abſolutely; ſome in *Spirituals* directly, and in *Temporals* only in *ordine ad Spiritualia*, an Abyſs from whence you may draw out what you pleaſe, and ſome of you in *Temporals* not at all; and you have not as yet given us your thoughts as to this difference amongſt you? Some of you aſſert in him a

Power

Power of *depoſing* Kings, diſpoſing of Kingdoms, transferring Titles unto Dominion, and Rule, for and upon ſuch miſcarriages as he ſhall judg to contein diſobedience unto the *Sea Apoſtolick*. Others love not to talk at this haughty rate, neither do I know what is your judgment in this matter. This, as I ſaid before I am ſure of, you cannot be of all theſe various contradictory judgments at once. Not to trouble you with Inſtances that might be multiplied of the like differences amongſt you; if notwithſtanding your adherence unto one part of the Contradiction in them, you judg your ſelf a Competent Advocate for your Church in generall, and do buſily employ your ſelf to win over Proſelytes unto her communion, have the patience to think, that one who in ſome few things differs from ſome other Proteſtants, is not wholly incapacitated thereby, to repell an unjuſt charge againſt Proteſtancy in generall.

I have done with the two generall heads of your prefatory Diſcourſe, and ſhall now only mark one or two incident particulars, that belong not unto them, and then proceed to ſee if we can meet with any thing of more importance, than what you have been pleaſed as yet to communicate unto us.

Pag. 5. Upon occaſion of a paſſage in my diſcourſe, wherein upon miſinformation, I expreſſed ſome trouble, that any young men ſhould be entangled with the Rhetorick and Sophiſtry of your *Fiat Lux*, you fall into an harangue, not inferiour unto ſome others in your Epiſtle, for that candour and ingenuity you give your ſelf unto.

Firſt, You make a Plea for *Gentlemen*, (not once named in my Diſcourſe) *That they muſt be allowed a ſenſe of Religion, as well as Miniſters*; that they

have the body, though not the cloak of Religion, and are masters of their own reason. But do you consider with your self, who it is that speaks these words, and to whom you speak them. Do you indeed desire that *Gentlemen* should have such a sense of Religion, and make use of their reason in the choice of that, which therein they adhere unto, as you pretend? Is this pretence consistent with your Plea in your *Fiat Lux*, wherein you labour to reduce them to a naked *fanaticall Credo*? Or is it your interest to court them with fine words, though your intention be far otherwise? But we in *England* like not such proceedings.

Ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν,
Ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ βάζῃ.

Nothing dislikes us more than dissimulation. And to whom do you speak? Did I, doth any Protestant deny, that Gentlemen may have? Do we not say, they ought to have their sense in Religion, and their senses exercised therein? Do we deny they ought to improve their reason, in being conversant about it? Are these the Principles of the Church of *Rome*, or of that of *England*? Do we not press them unto these things, as their principall duty in this world? Do we disallow or forbid them any means, that may tend to their furtherance in the knowledge and profession of Religion? Where is it, that if they do but look upon a Bible,

——— *Furiarum maxima juxta*
Accubat, & manibus prohibet contingere mentes.

The Inquisitor lays hold upon them, and bids them be contented with a *Rosary*, or our Ladies Psalter? Do we hinder or dissuade them from any Studies,

or

or the use of Books, that may encrease their knowledge, and improve their reason? And hath not the Papacy felt the fruits and effects of these Principles, in the writings of Kings, Princes, Noblemen, and Gentlemen, of all sorts? And do not you your self know all this to be true? And is it ingenuous to insist on contrary insinuations? Or do you think that truly generous Spirits will stoop to so poor a lure? But you proceed: *This is one difference between Catholick Countreys and ours, that there the Clergy man is only regarded for his vertue, and the power he hath received, or is at least believed to have received from God, in the great Ministery of our Reconciliation; and if he have any addition of learning besides, it is looked upon as a good accident all ornament, but not as any essentiall complement of his profession; so that it often happens without any wonderment at all, that the Gentleman-Patron is the learned man, and the Priest his Chaplain, of little or no science in comparison. But here in* England *our Gentlemen are disparaged by their own black Coats, and not suffered to use their judgement in any kind of learning, without a gibe from them. The Gentleman is reasonless, and the scribling Cassock is the only Scholar; he alone must speak all, know all, and only understand.* Sr, if your Clergy were respected only for their vertue, they would not be overburthened with their honour, unless they have much mended their manners, since all the world publickly complained of their lewdness, and which in many places the most would do so still, did they not judge the evil remediless. And if the state of things be in your *Catholick Countreys*, between the *Gentry* and *Clergy*, as you inform us, I fear it is not from the learning of the one, but the ignorance of the other. And this you seem to intimate, by rejecting

jecting *learning* from being any *essentiall* complement of their profession, wherein you do wisely, and what you are necessitated to do; for those who are acquainted with them, tell us, that if it were, you would have a very thin Clergy left you, very many of them not understanding the very Mass Book, which they daily chaunt, and therefore almost every word in your *Missale Romanum* is *accented*, that they may know how aright to pronounce them, which yet will not deliver them from that mistake of him, who instead of *Introibo ad altare Dei*, read constantly, *Introibo ad tartara Dei*. Herein we envy not the condition of your *Catholick Countreys*; and though we desire our Gentry were more learned than they are, yet neither we, nor they, could be contented to have our Ministers ignorant, so that they might be in veneration for that Office sake, which they are no way able to discharge. As to what you affirm concerning *England*, and our usage here, in the close of your Discourse, it is so utterly devoid of truth and honesty, that I cannot but wonder at your open regardlessness of them. Should you have written these things in *Spain* or *Italy*, (where you have made pictures of Catholicks put in Bears skins, and torn with Dogs in *England*, (*Eccles. Ang. Troph.*) concerning *England*, and the manners of the Inhabitants thereof, you might have hoped to have met with some, so partially addicted unto your faction and interest, as to suppose there were some colour of truth in what you averre. But to write these things here amongst us, in the face of the Sun, where every one that casts an eye upon them, will detest your confidence, and laugh at your folly, is a course of proceeding not easie to be paraleled.

I shall not insist on the particulars, there being not

not one word of truth in the whole, but leave you to the diſcipline of your own thoughts,

Occultum quatiente animo tortore flagellum.

And ſo I have done with your Prefatory Diſcourſe, wherein you have made it appear, with what reverence of God, and love to the Truth, you are converſant in the great concernments of the ſouls of men. What in particular you except againſt in the *Animadverſions*, I ſhall now proceed to the conſideration of.

CHAP. II.

Vindication of the firſt Chapter of the Animadverſions. The method of Fiat Lux. *Romaniſts doctrine of the Merit of Good Works.*

IN your exceptions to the firſt Chapter of the *Animadverſions pag.* 20. I wiſh I could find any thing agreeable unto Truth, according unto your own Principles. It was ever granted, that πολλὰ ψεύδεσθαι δοιδοὶ; but alwayes to fail, and faigne at pleaſure, was never allowed ſo much as to *Poets*. Men may oftentimes utter many things untrue, wherein yet ſome principles which they are perſwaded to be agreeable unto Truth, or ſome more generall miſtakes from whence their particular aſſertions proceed, may countenance their conſciences from a ſenſe of guilt, and ſome way ſhield their reputation from the ſharpneſs of cenſure: But willingly and often for a man practically to offend in this kind, when his mind and underſtanding is not impoſed upon by any previous miſtakes, is a miſcarriage, which I do not yet perceive that the ſubtileſt of your *Caſuiſts* have found out

out an excuſe for. Two Exceptions you lay againſt this Chapter, in the firſt whereof, by not ſpeaking the whole Truth, you render the whole untruth; and in the latter you plainly affirm that which your eyes told you to be otherwiſe. Firſt you ſay, I propoſed a dilemma unto you *for ſaying you had concealed your method*; when what I ſpake unto you was upon your ſaying, firſt that you had *uſed no method*, and afterwards that you had *concealed your method*; as you alſo in your next words here confeſs. Now both theſe being impoſſible, and ſeverally ſpoken by you, only to ſerve a preſent turn, your ſorry merriment about the *Scholler and his eggs*, will not free your ſelf from being very ridiculous. Certainly this uſing *no method*, and yet at the ſame time *concealing your method*, is part of that *civil Logick* you have learned no man knows where: You had farre better hide your weakneſſes under an univerſall ſilence, as you do to the moſt of them, than expoſe them afreſh unto publick contempt, trimmed up with froth and trifles. But this is but one of the leaſt of your eſcapes; you proceed to downright work in your following words; *Going on you deny* (ſay you) *that Proteſtants ever oppoſed the merit of Good Works; which at firſt I wondred at, ſeeing the ſound of it hath rung ſo often in my own ears, and ſo many hundred Books written in this laſt Age ſo apparently witneſs it in all places, till I found afterwards in my thorow peruſall of your Book, that you neither heed what you ſay, nor how much you deny; at laſt giving a diſtinction of the intrinſick acceptability of our Works, the eaſier to ſilence me, you ſay as I ſay.* Could any man, not acquainted with you, ever imagin, but that I had denied that *ever Proteſtants oppoſed the merit of Good Works*; you poſitively affirm I did ſo; you pretend

to

to tranſcribe my own words; you wonder why I ſhould ſay ſo; you produce teſtimony to diſprove what I ſay, and yet all this while you know well enough that I never *ſaid* ſo: have a little more care, if not of your *Conſcience*, yet of your *Reputation*; for ſeriouſly if you proceed in this manner, you will loſe the common Priviledge of being *believed* when you ſpeak truth. Your words in your *Fiat Lux*, p. 15. ed. 2. are, that *our Miniſters cull out various Texts (out of the Epiſtle of* Paul *to the* Romans) *againſt the Chriſtian doctrine of Good works and their merit*; wherein you plainly diſtinguiſh between the Chriſtian Doctrine of Good works, and their merit, as well you may; I tell you *pag.* 25, 26 that *no Proteſtant ever oppoſed the Chriſtian Doctrine of Good works*. Here you *repeat* my words as you pretend, and ſay, that I deny *that any Proteſtant ever oppoſed the Merit of Good Works*; and fall into a *fained wonderment* at mee, for ſaying that which you knew well enough I *never* ſaid: For *Merit* is not the *Chriſtian*, but rather as by you explained, the *Antichriſtian Doctrine* of Good works, as being perfectly *Anti-Evangelicall*. What *Merit* you will eſteem this *Good work* of yours to have, I know not, and have in part intimated what truely it doth deſerve. But you adde, that *making a diſtinction of the intrinſick acceptability of works, you ſay as I ſay*: What is that I pray? do I ſay, that *Proteſtants oppoſe the Chriſtian Doctrine of Good works*, as you ſay, in your *Fiat*; or do I ſay, that they *never oppoſed the Merit of Good works*, as you fain me to ſay in your *Epiſtle*? neither the one nor the other: but I ſay that *Proteſtants* teach the *Chriſtian Doctrine of Good works*, as revealed in the Goſpell, and oppoſe the *Merit of Good works*, by you invented, and as by you explained,

ed, and now avowed. And whileſt you talk at this rate, as if you were perfectly *innocent*, you begin your *ſtory* as if you had nothing to do but to accuſe another of fraud, like him that cried,

——— *Nec ſi me miſerum fortuna Sinonem*
Finxit, vanum etiam mendacemq; improba fingit.

when you know what his buſineſs was. But the truth is, when you talk of the *merit of Good works*, you ſtand in a ſlippery place, and know not well what you would have, nor what it is that you would have me believe. Your *Tridentine Convention* hath indeed provided a limber *Cothurnus* to fit if it were poſſible your ſeverall ſtatures and poſtures. But generall words are nothing but the proportion of a *Cirque* or *Arena* for *Dogmatiſts* to contend within the limits of. The Antient *Eccleſiaſticall* importance of the word *Merit*, wherein as it may be proved by numberleſs inſtances, it denoted no more than *to obtain*, you have the moſt of you, rejected, and do urge it in a ſtrict *Legall* ſenſe, denoting working *for a reward*, and performing that which is proportionable unto it, as the labour of the Hireling is to his wages, according unto the ſtrict Rules of Juſtice. See your *Rhem. An.* 1 *Cor.* 3. *Heb.* 6. 10. So is the judgment I think of your Church explained by *Suarez*, Tom. 1. in Thom. 3. d. 41. *A Supernaturall work*, ſaith he, *proceeding from Grace in its ſelf, and in its own nature, hath a proportion unto, and condignity of the reward, and is of ſufficient value, to be worth the ſame.* And you ſeem to be of the ſame opinion in owning that deſcription of *Merit*, which Proteſtants reject, which I gave in my *Animadverſions*; namely *an intrinſecall worth and value in works ariſing from the exact anſwerableneſs unto the Law, and proportion unto the reward,*

ward, ſo as on the Rules of Juſtice to deſerve it. Of the ſame mind are moſt of you; See *Andrad. Orthodox. Explic.* lib. 6. *Bagus de Merit. Op. Lib. 1. cap. 9.* Though I can aſſure you, *Paul* was not, *Rom.* 6. 23. *Ch.* 8. 18. ſo that you muſt not take it ill, If *Proteſtants* oppoſe this Doctrine, with Teſtimonies out of his *Epiſtle* to the *Romanes*, as well as out of many other portions of the holy Writ; for they look upon it as an opinion perfectly *deſtructive* of the Covenant of Grace. Nay I muſt tell you, that ſome of your own Church and way, love not to talk at this high and lofty rate. *Ferus* ſpeaks plain unto you on *Mat.* 20. *If you deſire to hold the Grace and favour of God, make no mention of your own merits.* *Durand* ſticks not to call the opinion which you ſeem to eſpouſe, *temerarious*, yea *blaſphemous*, Queſt. 2. d. 27. In the *explication* of your diſtinction of *congruity* and *condignity*, how wofully are you divided? as alſo in the *application* of it? there is no end of your altercations about it; the termes of it being *horrid*, *uncouth*, ſtrangers to Scripture and the antient Church, of an *arbitrary* ſignification, about which men may with probabilities contend to the worlds end, and yet the very ſoul and life of your Doctrine of *Merit* lies in it. Some aſcribe Merit of *Congruity* to works *before Grace*, and of *Condignity* to them done in a ſtate of Grace; ſome, *Merit* of *Congruity* to them, done by Grace, and Merit of *Condignity* they utterly exclude: Some give *Grace* and the *Promiſe* a place in *Merit*; ſome ſo explain it, that they can have no place at all therein. Generally in your Books of *Devotion*, when you have to do with *God*, you begin to bethink your ſelves, and ſpeak much more humbly and modeſtly, than you do when you endeavour to *diſpute ſubtilly* and quell your Adverſaries. And I am

not

not without hope, that many of you do *personally* believe as to your own particular *concernments*, far better than when you *doctrinally* express your selves, when you contend with us: As when that famous Emperour *Charles the fifth*, after all his bustles in and about Religion, came to *die* in his retirement, he expressly renounced all *merit of works*, as a proud figment, and gave up himself to the *sole Grace* and Mercy of God in Jesus Christ, on whose purchase of Heaven for him, he alone relied. *Toto pectori in Deum revolutus sic ratiocinabatur*, saith the renowned *Thuanus*, Hist. lib. 21. *se quidem indignum esse qui propriis meritis regnum Cælorum obtineret; sed Dominum Deum suum qui illud duplici jure obtinuit, & patris hæreditate, & passionis merito, altero contentum esse, alterum sibi donare, ex cujus dono illud sibi merito vindicet, hacq; fiducia fretus minime confundatur; neq; enim oleum misericordiæ, nisi in vase fiducia poni: hanc homines fiduciam esse à se deficientis & innitentis Domino suo, alioqui propriis meritis fidere non fidei esse, sed perfidiæ; peccata remitti per Dei indulgentiam, idcoq; credere nos debere, peccata deleri non posse, nisi ab eo, cui soli peccavimus, & in quem peccatum non cadit, per quem solum nobis peccata condonantur.* Words worthy of a lasting memory, which they will not fail of where they are recorded. *Casting himself*, saith that excellent *Historian*, *with his whole soul upon God, he thus reasoned; That for his part he was on the account of any merits of his own, unworthy to obtain the Kingdom of Heaven; but his Lord and God, who hath a double right unto it, one by inheritance of his Father, the other by the merit of his own passion, contented himself with the one, granted the other unto him; by whose grant, he rightly (or deservedly) laid claim thereunto; and resting in this faith*

faith or confidence, he was not confounded; for the oyl of mercy is not powred but into the vessel of faith: this is the faith or confidence of a man fainting or despairing in himself, and resting on his Lord; and otherwise to trust to our own merits, is not an act of faith but of infidelity or perfidiousness; that sins are forgiven by the mercy of God, and that therefore we ought to believe that sins cannot be blotted out or forgiven, but by him against whom we have sinned, who sinneth not, and by whom alone our sins are pardoned. This Sr is the faith of *Protestants* in reference unto the *merit of works*, which that Wise and Mighty *Emperour*, after all his *Military* actings against them, found the only safe Anchor for his soul in *extremis*, his only relief against crying out with *Hadrian*

Animula vagula, blandula,
Hospes, comesq; corporis,
Qua nunc abibis in loca?
Pallidula, frigida, nudula
Nec, ut soles, dabis jocos.

The only *Antidote* against *despair*, the only stay of a soul when once entring the *lists* of Eternity. And I am perswaded, that many of *you* fix on the same *Principles*, as to your hope and expectation of Life and Immortality. And to what purpose, I pray you, do you trouble the world with an *opinion*, wherein you can find no *benefit*, when, if *true* you should principally expect to be relieved and supported by it. But he that looks to find *solid peace* and consolation in this world, or a blessed entrance into another, on any other grounds than those expressed by that dying *Emperour*, will find himself deceived. Sr, you will one day find, that our *own works* or *merits*, Purgatory, the sufferage of your Church, or

any parts of it, when we are dead, the *surplussage* of the works or merits of other sinners, are *pitifull things* to come into competition with the blood of Christ, and pardoning-Mercy in him. I confess, the *Inquisition* made a shift to destroy *Constantine* who was confessor to the *Emperour*, and assisted him unto his departure. And King *Philip* took care that his Son *Charles* should not live in the faith wherein his Father *Charles* died; whereby *Merit*, or our own Righteousness, prevailed at *Court*: but, as I said, I am perswaded that when many of you are in cold blood, and think more of *God* than of *Protestants*, and of your *last* account than of your *present* Arguments, you begin to believe that Mercy and the Righteousness of Christ will be a *better plea*, as to your own particular concernments at the last day. Seeing therefore that *Protestants* teach the *necessity* of Good works upon the cogent Principles I minded you of in my *Animadversions*, I suppose it might not be amiss in you to surcease from troubling them about their *Merit*, which few of you are *agreed* about, and which, as I would willingly hope, none of you dare *trust* unto. You have, I suppose, been minded before now of the conclusion made in this matter by your great Champion *Ballarmin*, lib. 5. *de Justificat.* cap. 7. *Propter* (saith he) *incertitudinem propriæ justitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, TUTISSIMUM est, fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia & benignitate reponere*: *Because of the uncertainty of our own righteousness, and the danger of vain-glory, it is the* Safest course *to place all our confidence in the alone mercy and benignity of God*: Wherein, if I mistake not, he disclaimeth all that he had subtilly disputed before about the merit of Works; and he appears to have been in good earnest in this conclusion, seeing he made

made such use of it himself in particular, at the close of all his Disputes and Dayes; praying in his last Will and Testament, That God would deal with him, not as *æstimator meriti*, a Judg of his merit, but *largitor venia* a mercifull Pardoner; *Vit. Bell. per Sylvestr. à Pet. San. Impress. Antverpiæ* 1631. And why is this the *safest* course? certainly it must be, because God hath appointed it and revealed it so to be; for on no other ground can any course towards Heaven be accounted safe. And if this be the way of his appointment, that we should trust to his mercy alone in Christ Jesus; let them that will be so minded, notwithstanding all perswasions to the contrary, as to trust to their own merit, take heed lest they find when it is too late, that they have steered a course not so safe as they expected. And so I desire your excuse for this Diversion, the design of it being only to discover one reason of your *failing* in morality, in affirming mee to have said that which you knew well enough I did not; which is this, that you stood in a slippery place as to the *point of faith* which you were asserting, being not instructed how to speak constantly and evenly unto it. And to take you off from that *vain confidence*, which this proud opinion of the *Merit of works*, is apt to ingenerate in you; whose first Inventours, I fear, did not sufficiently consider with whom they had to doe, before whom sinners appearing in their own strength and Righteousness will one day cry, *Who amongst us shall dwell with devouring fire, Who amongst us shall inhabit with everlasting burnings?* nor the purity, perfection and severity of his *fiery Law*, judging, condemning, cursing *every* sinner for every sinne, without the least intimation of mercy or compassion; if you would but

ſeriouſly conſider, how impoſſible it is for any man to know all his *ſecret ſinnes*, or to make compenſation to God for the *leaſt of them* that he doth know, and that the very *beſt of his works* come ſhort of that *univerſal perfection* which is required in them, ſo that he dares not put the iſſue of his *eternal condition* upon any one of them *ſingly*, though all the reſt of his life ſhould be put into everlaſting *oblivion*; and withall would diligently enquire into the *end* of God in giving his Son to die for ſinners, with the *myſtery* of his Love and Grace therein, the nature of the *New Covenant*, the Importance of the Promiſes thereof, the weight that is layed in Scripture on the *Righteouſneſs and blood of Chriſt* with the Redemption that is purchaſed thereby; or to the whole work of our Salvation, and the peremptory excluſion of the *merit of our works* by *Paul* from our Juſtification before God; I am perſwaded you would find another manner of *Reſt* and Peace unto your ſoul, than all *your own works*, and your other pretended ſupplements of them, or reliefs againſt their defects, are able to ſupply you withall. And this I hope you will not be offended at, that I have thus occaſionally minded you of.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A defence of the ſecond Chapter of the Animadverſions. Principles of Fiat Lux *re-examined. Of our receiving the Goſpell from* Rome. *Our abode with them, from whom we received it.*

IN the ſame *page*, you proceed to the conſideration of my *ſecond Chapter*; and therein of the Principles which I gathered out of your *Fiat Lux*; and which I affirmed, to *run through* and to animate your whole Diſcourſe, and to be the foundation on which your Superſtructure is built. Concerning them all, you ſay, *pag.* 21. *that in the ſenſe the words do either naturally make out, or in which I underſtand them, of all the whole you can hardly own any one.* Pray Sr, remember that I never pretended to ſet down *your words*, but to expreſs *your ſenſe* in my own. And if I do not make it appear, that there is no *one* of the *Principles* mentioned, which you have not (in the ſenſe by me declared) affirmed, and aſſerted; I will be contented to be thought to have done you *ſome* wrong, and my ſelf *much more*, for want of attending unto that *Rule* of *Truth*, which I am compelled ſo often to deſire you to give up your ſelf unto the conduct of.

The firſt *Principle* imputed unto your *Fiat Lux* is, *That we received the Goſpell firſt from* Rome. To which you ſay, *Wee, that is we Engliſh men, received it firſt from thence.* Well then, this is one Principle of the *Ten*; this you own and ſeek to defend. If you do ſo in reference unto any other, what will become of your *hardly one that you can own?* You have already *one foot* over the limits which you have newly

preſcribed your ſelf; and we ſhall find you utterly *forſaking* of them by and by. For the preſent you proceed unto the defence of this *Principle* and ſay, *But againſt this you reply, that we received it not firſt from* Rome, *but by* Joſeph *of* Arimathea *from* Paleſtine, *as* Fiat Lux *himſelf acknowledgeth: S^r, if* Fiat Lux *ſay both theſe things, he cannot mean them in your falſe contradictory ſenſe, but in his own true one, We, that is, we Engliſhmen, the now actuall inhabitants of this Land and progeny of the Saxons, received firſt our Goſpell and Chriſtendome from* Rome, *though the Brittans that inhabited the Land before, differing as much from us as Antipodes, had ſome of them been Chriſtened long before us, and yet the Chriſtendome that prevailed and laſted among the Brittans, even they alſo as well as we, had it from* Rome *too; mark this likewiſe.* This matter muſt be called *over again* afterwards, and therefore I ſhall here be the more brief upon it. In my firſt *Anſwer*, I ſhewed you not only that your poſition was not *true*; but alſo, that on ſuppoſition it were *ſo*, it would not in the leaſt advance your intention. Here you acknowledg that the *Brittans* at firſt received not the Goſpell from *Rome*; but reply two things, firſt, *that belongs not unto us Engliſhmen or Saxons.* To which I ſhall now only ſay, that if becauſe the *Brittans* have been *conquered*, we who are now the inhabitants of *Brittain*, may not be thought to have received the Goſpell from them, from whom the *Brittans* at firſt received it, ſeeing it was never utterly extinct in *Brittany* from its firſt plantation, then much leſs can the preſent inhabitants of the City of *Rome*, which hath been conquered oftener than *Brittain*, be thought to have received the Goſpell from them by whom it was firſt delivered unto the old *Romans*. For though I confeſs that the *Saxons*,

Jutes,

Jutes, and *Angles* made great havock of the *Antient Brittans* in some parts of this *Island*, yet was it not comparable unto that which was made at *Rome*; which at length *Totilas*, after it had been taken and sacked more than once before, marching out of it against *Belisarius*, left as desolate as a wilderness without one living soul to inhabit it. *Ipse* (Totilas) *cum suarum copiarum parte progreditur, Romanos qui Senatorii erant ordinis secum trahens; alia omni urbanorum multitudine vel virili muliebrique sexu, & pueris in Campania agros missis: ita ut Romæ nemo hominum resideret, sed vasta ibi esset solitudo*, saith *Procopius*, *Hist. Goth. l.* 3. Concerning which action saith *Sigonius de Imper. Occid. lib.* 19. *Urbs Roma incolis omnibus amotis, prorsus est destituta: memorandum inter panca exempla humanæ fortunæ ludibrium, ac spectaculum ipsis etiam hostibus, quanquam ab omni humanitate remotissimis, miserandum.* *The City of* Rome, *all its Inhabitants being removed, was wholly desolate, an unparallel'd reproach of humane condition, and a spectacle of pity to the very enemies, though most remote from all humanity!* The next inhabitants of it, were a mixture of *Greeks*, *Thracians*, and other Nations brought in by *Belisarius*: You may go now and reproach the *Brittans* if you please, with their being conquered by the *Saxons*; in the mean time pray give me a reason, why the present *Inhabitants* of *England*, may not date their reception of Christianity from the *first* planting of it in this *Island*, as well as you suppose the present *Inhabitants* of *Rome* may do theirs, from the time wherein it was *first* preached unto the old *Romans*? But you except again, *that the Christendom that prevailed and lasted among the* Brittans *before the coming of the* Saxons, *came from* Rome *too*; *you bid me, mark that likewise.*

I do conſider what you *ſay*, and deſire you to *prove* it: wherein yet I will not be very urgent, becauſe I will not put you upon impoſſibilities; and your incompetency to give the leaſt colour unto this *Remarkable Aſſertion*, ſhall be diſcovered in our further progreſs. For the preſent, I ſhall only mind you, that the Chriſtianity which prevailed in *Brittany*, was that which continued among the *Brittans* in *Wales*, after the conqueſt of theſe parts of the *Iſland* by the *Saxons*; and that, *that* came not from *Rome*, is manifeſt from the *cuſtomes* which they obſerved and inſiſted on, differing from thoſe of *Rome*, and your refuſall to *admit* thoſe of that Church, the ſtory whereof you have in *Beda lib. 2. cap. 2.* I know, it may be rationally replied, that *Rome* might, after the time of the firſt preaching of the Goſpell in *Brittain*, have *invented* many new cuſtoms, which might be ſtrange unto the *Brittans* at the coming of *Auſtin*; for indeed ſo they had done: but this exception will here take no place; for the cuſtomes the *Britiſh* Church adhered unto, were ſuch as having their Riſe and occaſion in the *Eaſt*, were never *admitted* at *Rome*, and ſo from thence could not be *tranſmitted* hither.

But there were alſo other *Exceptions* put in, unto your Application of this Principle unto your purpoſe, upon ſuppoſition that there were any Truth in the *matter of Fact* aſſerted by you. For, ſuppoſe that thoſe who from beyond Sea firſt preached the Goſpell to the *Saxons*, came from *Rome*, yea were ſent by the *Biſhop*, or if you pleaſe the *Pope* of *Rome*; I aſk, whether it was *his Religion*, or the Religion of *Jeſus Chriſt* that they brought with them? Did the *Pope* firſt find it out? or did they publiſh it in the name of the Pope? You ſay, *It was the Popes Religion*,

gion, not invented but profeſſed by him, and from him derived unto us by his Miſſioners. Well, and what more; for all this was before *ſuppoſed* in my enquiry, and made the foundation of that which we ſought *further* after. I ſuppoſed the *Pope* profeſſed the Religion which he ſent; and your Courtly expreſſion *derived unto us by his Miſſioners*, is but the ſame in ſenſe and meaning with my homely phraſe, *they that preached it were ſent by him*. On this I enquire, whether it were to be eſteemed *his* Religion or no; that is, any more *his*, than it is the Religion of every *one* that profeſſeth it; Or did thoſe that were ſent *baptize* in his name, or teach us that the *Pope* was crucified for us? You anſwer, *that he ſent them to preach*: I ſee

——*Nil opus eſt te*
Circumagi, quendam volo viſere non tibi notum.

you underſtand not what I enquire after; but if that be all you have to ſay, as it was *before* ſuppoſed, ſo what matter is it, I pray, who *planted*, and who *watered*; it was the Religion of *Chriſt* that was preached, and God that *gave the encreaſe*: Chriſt liveth ſtill, his Word abideth ſtill, but the *planters* and *waterers* are dead long ago. Again, What though we received the Goſpell from *Rome*? doth it therefore follow, that we received all the Doctrines of the *preſent Church* of *Rome* at the ſame time? Pope *Gregory* knew little of the preſent *Romane* Doctrine about the *Pope* of *Rome*. What was broached of it, he condemned in another, (even *John* of *Conſtantinople*, who faſted for a kind of *Popedome*,) and profeſſed himſelf an obedient ſervant to his *good Lord* the Emperour. Many a good Doctrine hath been loſt at *Rome* ſince thoſe old dayes, and many a *new fancy* broached, and many a *tradition* of men taught

for

for a doctrine of truth.

Hipolyte, sic est; Thesti vultus amo,
Illos priores quos tulit quondam puer,
Quum prima puras barba signaret genas,
Et ora flavus teneras tingebat rubor.

We love the Church of *Rome*, as it was in its *purity* and integrity, in the dayes of *her youth* and chastity, before she was deflowred by *false worship*; but what is that to the present *Roman* carnall confederacy? If then any in this Nation did receive their Religion from *Rome*, as many of the *Saxons* had Christianity declared unto them, by some sent from *Rome* for that purpose; yet it doth not at all follow, that they received the present Religion of *Rome*.

Hei mihi qualis? —— quantum mutatur ab illa? which of old she professed.

Multa dies variusq; labor mutabilis ævi,
Rettulit in pejus.

And this sad alteration, *declension*, and change, we may bewail in her, as the Prophet did the like apostacy in the Church of the Jews of old, *How is the faithfull City become an harlot? it was full of judgement, righteousness lodged in it, but now murderers; thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixt with water.* He admires that it *should* be so; was not ignorant *how* it became so; no more are others in reference unto your Apostacy.

And what if we had received from *you*, or by your means, the Religion that is now professed at *Rome*, I mean the whole of it; yet we might have received that with it, namely the *Bible*, which would have made it our duty, to *examine*, *try*, and reject any thing in it, for which we saw from thence just cause

so

ſo to do; unleſs we ſhould be *condemned* for that, for which the *Bereans* are ſo highly *commended*. So that neither is your Poſition *true*, nor if it were ſo would it at all *advantage* your pretenſions.

I adde alſo, *Did not the Goſpel come from another place to* Rome, *as well as to us, or, was it firſt preached there*? This you have culled out, as ſuppoſing your ſelf able to ſay ſomething unto it; and what is it? *Properly ſpeaking, it came not ſo to* Rome, *as it came to us: for one of the twelve fountains, nay two of the thirteen, and thoſe the largeſt and greateſt, were tranſferred to* Rome, *which they watered with their blood. We had never any ſuch ſtanding fountain of our Chriſtian Religion here, but only a ſtream derived unto us from thence.* It is the hard hap it ſeems of *England*, to claim any priviledge or reputation, that may ſtand in the way of ſome mens deſigns. No *Apoſtle*, nor *Apoſtolicall* Perſon, muſt be allowed to preach the Goſpel unto us, leſt we ſhould *peirk* up into competition with *Rome*. But though *Rome* it ſeems muſt alwayes be excepted, yet I hope you do not in generall conclude our condition *beneath* that of any place, where the Goſpel at firſt was preached, by *one* or *two Apoſtles*, ſo as to cry, *Properly ſpeaking, it came not to us at all*. What think you of *Jeruſalem*, where Chriſt himſelf and his twelve Apoſtles all of them preached the Goſpel? Or what think you of *Capernaum*, that was *lifted up to Heaven*, in the priviledge of the means of light granted for a while unto them? Do you think our condition worſe than theirs? The *two fountains* you mention, were opened at *Antioch* in *Syria*, as well as at other places, before they conveyed one *drop* of their treaſures to *Rome*; which whether one of them ever did by his *perſonall* preſence,

ſence, is very queſtionable. And by this Rule of yours, though *England* may not, yet every place where St *Peter* and St *Paul* preached the Goſpel, may contend with *Rome* as to this priviledge. And what will you then get by your triumphing over us? *Non vides id mantica quòd à tergo eſt*: When men are intent upon a *ſuppoſed advantage*, they oftentimes overlook *reall inconveniencies* that lye ready to ſeize upon them, as it befalls you more than once. Beſides there is nothing in the world more obſcure, than by *whom*, or by *what* means the Goſpel was firſt preached at *Rome*: By St *Paul* it is certain it was *not*: for before ever he came thither, there was a great number converted to the faith, as appears from his *Epiſtle*, written about the *fourteenth* year of *Claudius*, and the *fifty third* of Chriſt. Nor yet by *Peter*; for not at preſent to inſiſt on the great incertainty whether *ever* he was there or no, which ſhall afterwards be ſpoken unto, there is nothing more certain, than that about the ſixth year of *Claudius*, and fourty fifth of Chriſt, he was at *Antioch*, Gal. 2. (*Baronius* makes the third of *Claudius*, and the fourty fifth of Chriſt to *contemporize*, but upon a miſtake) and ſome ſay he abode there a good while, *ſundry years*, and that upon as good authority, as any is produced for his coming to *Rome*. But it is generally granted, that there was a Church founded at *Rome* that year, but by whom, ἄδηλον παντὶ πλὴν ἢ τῷ θεῷ, (as *Socrates* ſaid of the preference of the condition of the living or dead) *is known to God alone, of mortall men not to any*: *Jam ſumus ergo partes*. For, to confeſs the truth unto you, I know not certainly who firſt preached the Goſpel in *Brittain*; ſome ſay *Peter*, ſome *Paul*, ſome *Simon Zelotes*, moſt *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, as I have elſewhere ſhewed

ed; by whom certainly I know not: but ſome *one* it was or more, whom God ſent upon his *arrand*, and with his meſſage. No more do you know who preached it firſt at *Rome*, though in generall it appears that ſome of them at leaſt were of the *Circumciſion*, whence the very firſt *Converts* of that Church, were variouſly minded about the obſervation of *Moſaicall* Rites and Ceremonies. And I doubt not but God in his infinitely holy *Wiſdome* and providence, left the *ſprings* of Chriſtian Religion, as to matter of fact, in the firſt introductions of it into the Nations of the world, in ſo much *darkneſs*, as to the knowledge of after-times, to obviate thoſe towring *thoughts* of *preheminency*, which he foreſaw that ſome men from externall *advantages* would entertain, to the no ſmall prejudice of the *ſimplicity* of the Goſpel, and ruine of Chriſtian humility. As far as appears from Story; the Goſpel was preached in *England*, before any Church was founded at *Rome*: It was ſo, ſaith *Gildas*, *Summo tempore Tiberii Cæſaris*, that is, *extremo*; about the end of the raign of *Tiberius Cæſar*, who died in the thirty ninth year of Chriſt, five or ſix years at leaſt before the foundations of the *Roman*-Church were layed; ἡ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτα. Theſe things we muſt ſpeak unto, becauſe you ſuppoſe them of importance unto your Cauſe.

The ſecond Aſſertion aſcribed unto your *Fiat* in the *Animadverſions* is, *That whence and from whom we firſt received our Religion, there and with them we muſt abide therein, to them we muſt repair for guidance; and return to their rule and conduct, if we have departed from them.* To which you now ſay, *This Principle as it is never delivered by* Fiat Lux, *though you put it upon me, ſo is it in the latitude it carries,*

[*and*

and wherein you understand it, absolutely false, never thought of by me, and indeed impossible: For how can we abide with them in any truth, who may not perhaps abide in it themselves? Great part of Flanders *was first converted by Englishmen, and yet are they not obliged to accompany the English in our now present wayes.* I am glad you confess this Principle now to be *false*; it was sufficiently proved so to be in the *Animadversions*, and your whole *Discourse* rendred thereby useless: For to what purpose will the preceding Assertion so often inculcated by you serve, if this be *false*? For what matter is it from *whence* or *whom* we receive the profession of Religion, if there be no obligation upon us to *continue* in their communion, any further than as we judge them to *continue* in the truth? And to what purpose do you avoid the consideration of the *Reasons* and *Causes* of our not abiding with you, and manage all your Charge upon the generall head of our *departure*, if we may have just cause by your own concession so to do? It is *false* then by your own acknowledgement, and I am as sure, in the sense which I understand it in, that it is *yours*. And you labour with all your art to prove and confirm it, both in your *Fiat*, pag. 44, 45, 46, 47. and in this very *Epistle*, pag. 38, 39, 40, 41, *&c.* On the account that the Gospel came unto us from *Rome*, you expressly adjudge the *preheminence* over us unto *Rome*, and determine that her we must all hear, and obey, and *abide* with. But if you may *say* and *unsay*, assert and deny, avow and disclaim at your pleasure, as things make for your advantage, and think to evade the owning of the whole *drift* and scope of your Discourse, by having expressed your self in a *loose* flourish of words; it will be to no great purpose further to talk with you:

Nay

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

To lay *faſt hold*, and not ſtartle at a new ſhape, was the counſell his daughter gave to *Menelaus*. And I muſt needs urge you to leave off all thoughts of *evading*, by ſuch changes of your *hue*, and to abide by what you ſay. I confeſs, I believe you never intended knowingly to aſſert this *Principle* in its whole latitude, becauſe you did not, as it ſhould ſeem, conſider how little it would make for your *advantage*, ſeeing ſo many would come in for a *ſhare* in the priviledge intimated in it with your *Roman Church*, and you do not in any thing love competitors. But you would fain have the Concluſion hold as to your *Roman Church* only; thoſe that have received the Goſpel from *her*, muſt alwayes abide in her communion. That this Aſſertion is not built on any generall *foundation* of Reaſon or Authority, your ſelf now confeſs. And that you have no ſpeciall *priviledge* to plead in this Cauſe, hath been proved in the *Animadverſions*, whereof you are pleaſed to take no notice.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Further Vindication of the first Chapter of the Animadversions. Church of Rome *not what she was of old. Her Falls and Apostacy. Difference between Idolatry, Apostacy, Heresie, and Schism. Principles of the Church of* Rome *condemned by the antient Church-Fathers, and Councels. Imposing Rites unnecessary. Persecution for Conscience. Papall Supremacy. The Branches of it. Papall Personall Infallibility. Religious veneration of Images.*

THe third Assertion which you review is, *That the Roman profession of Religion, and practice in the worship of God, are every way the same as when first we received the Gospel from* Rome, *nor can they ever otherwise be*; whereunto you say, *This indeed though I do no where formally express it, yet I suppose it, because I know it hath been demonstratively proved a hundred times over. You deny it hath been proved, why do you not then disprove it? because you decline, say you, all common places.* All that I affirmed was, that you did suppose this *Principle*, and built many of your *Inferences* on the supposition thereof, which you here acknowledge. And so you have already owned *two* of the *Principles*, whereof in the foregoing Page you affirmed, that *you could hardly own any one*, and that in the sense wherein by me they are proposed and understood. But what do you mean that you no *where formally express it?* If you mean, that you have not set it down in those *syllables*, wherein you find it expressed in the *Animadversions*, no man ever said you did; you do not use to speak so openly

openly and plainly: To do so would bring you out of the *corners*, which somewhat that you pretend unto never lead you into. But if you deny, that you asserted and laboured to prove the *whole and entire matter* of it, your following Discourse wherein you endeavour a vindication of the *Sophisme*, wherewith you pleaded for it in your *Fiat*, will sufficiently confute you. And so you have avowed already *two*, of the *hardly any one*, Principles ascribed unto you: And this you say hath been *demonstratively proved an hundred times over*, and ask me why I do not disprove it, giving a ridiculous Answer, as from me, unto your Enquiry. But pray Sr talk not of *Demonstrations* in this matter; palpable *Sophismes*, such as your Masters use in this Cause, are far enough from *Demonstrations*. And if you think it enough for you to say, that *it hath been proved*, why is it not a sufficient Answer in me to remind you that it hath *been disproved*, and your pretended proofs all refuted. And according to what Rules of *Logick*, do you expect *Arguments* from me to disprove your Assertion, whilest I was only answering yours that you produced in its confirmation? But that you may not *complain* any more, I shall make some addition of the *proofs* you require by way of supererrogation, when we have considered your vindication of your former *Arguments*, for the confirmation of this Assertion, wherewith you closed your Discourse in your *Fiat Lux*. This you thus propose again, *The Roman was once a true flourishing Church, and if she ever fell, she must fall either by Apostasie, Heresie, or Schisme.* So you now mince the matter; in your *Fiat* it was *a most pure flourishing and Mother Church*; and you know there are many that yet acknowledge her a *true Church*, as a *sheif* is a *true man*; who will

not acknowledge her to be a *pure* Church, much leſs *moſt pure*. God be mercifull to poor worms, this boaſting doth not become us; it is not unlike hers who cryed, *Is it as a Queen and ſhall ſee no ſorrow*; I wiſh you begin to be ſenſible and aſhamed of it: But yet I fear it is otherwiſe; for whereas in your *Fiat* you had proclaimed your *Roman Church* and Party, to be *abſolutely innocent and unblameable*, you tell us *pag.* 10. of your Epiſtle, that you can make it appear that it is *far more innocent and amiable than you have made it*; more than *abſolutely innocent* it ſeems, a note ſo *high* that it ſounds hatſhly. And whereas we ſhall manifeſt your Church to have loſt her *native beauty*, we know that no *painting* of her, which is all you can do, will render her truly *amiable* unto a ſpirituall eye: She hath too often defiled her ſelf, to pretend now to be lovely. But to this you ſay I reply, *The Church that then was in the Apoſtles time was indeed true, not the Roman Church that now is*; and adde, *So, ſo, then I ſay that former true Church muſt fall ſometime or other, when did ſhe fall, and how did ſhe fall by Apoſtaſie, Hereſie, & Schiſme.* Sr, you very lamely repreſent my *Anſwer*, that you might ſeem to ſay ſomething unto it, when indeed you ſay nothing at all. I diſcover unto you the *equivocation* you uſe in that expreſſion, the *Church of Rome*, and ſhew you that the *thing* now ſo called by you, had neither *being* nor name, neither *eſſence* nor affection in the dayes of old; its very being is but the *terminus ad quem*, of a Churches fall. I ſhewed you alſo, that the Church of old that was *pure*, fell, not whileſt it was ſo, but that the men who ſucceeded in the place, where they lived in the profeſſion of Religion, *gradually* fell from the purity of that profeſſion, which the Church at its firſt planting did enjoy.

enjoy. But all that discourse you *pass* by, and repeat again your *former* Question, to which you subjoyn my first Answer, which was, it was possible she might *fall by an Earthquake*, as did those of *Colosse and Laodicea*; to which you, *We speak not here of any casuall or naturall downfall, or death of mortals, by Plague, Famine, or Earthquake, but a morall and voluntary lapse in faith. What do you speak to me of Earthquakes?* It is well you do *so* now explain your self; your former enquiry was only in generall, *how* or by *what means* she ceased to be what she had been before, asthough it were impossible to assign any such; neither did I exclude the *sense* whereunto you now restrain your words. And had I only shewed you, that it was *possible* she might fall, and come to nothing, and yet not by any of the wayes or means by you mentioned, without proceeding unto the consideration of them also, yet your *especiall* enquiry being resolved into this *generall* one, from whence it is taken, how a *pure flourishing Church may cease to be so*, I had rendred your enquiry *useless* unto your present purpose, though I had not answered your intention: For certainly that which ceaseth to *be*, ceaseth to *be pure*, seeing *non entis nullæ sunt affectiones*. The Church of the *Brittains* in this part of the *Island*, now called *England*, was once as *pure* a Church as ever was the Church of *Rome*, yet she ceased to be long since, and that neither by *Apostasie, Heresie*, nor *Schisme*, but by the sword of the *Saxons*. And to tell you the truth, I do not think the old Church of *Rome* unconcerned in this instance, then especially when *Rome* was left desolate by *Totilas*, and without inhabitant; for the Church of *Rome* is *urbis*, and not as you vainly imagine, *orbis Ecclesia*.

Again, I told you she might fall by *Idolatry*, and so neither by *Apostasie*, *Heresie*, or *Schisme*. To which you reply, *Good Sr, Idolatry is a mixt misdemeanour both in faith and manners; I speak of the single one of faith; and he that falls by Idolatry, if he keep still some parts of Christianity entire, he falls by Heresie, by Apostasie if he keep none.* I am perswaded you are the first that ever gave this description of *Idolatry*, and the last that will do so; *it is a mixt misdemeanour in faith and manners*. *Manners* you speak of in contradistinction to *Faith*, and you so explain your self, in which sense they relate only unto *morall conversation*, regulated by the *second Table*. That *Idolatry* hath been and is constantly attended with *corruption in manners*, the Apostle declares, *Rom.* 1. and I willingly grant; but how in its self, or its own nature, it should come to be a *mixt misdemeanour in faith and in manners*, I know not; neither can you tell me which is the *fleshy*, which is the *fishy* part of this *Dagon*; what it is in it that is a misdemeanour in *faith*, and what in *manners*. According to this description of yours, an *Idolater* should be an ill mannered, or an *unmannerly Heretick*. But you speak of the *single misdemeanour in faith*; but who gave you leave so to restrain your enquiry? I allowed you before to except against *one instance*, whereby many a Church hath fallen; but if you will except *Idolatry* and *Manners* also, your endeavour to provide a shelter for your guilt, is *shamefull* and vain. For what you except out of your enquiry, if you confess not to *have* been, yet you do that it *may* be, or *might* have been: And you do wisely to let your Adversary know, that he is to strike you only where you suppose your self *armed*, but by all means must let your *naked* parts alone; and dout-

doubtleſs he muſt needs be very wiſe who will take your advice. The Church of *Judah* was once a *pure* Church in the dayes of *David*; how came ſhe then to fall? by *Apoſtaſie*, *Hereſie*, or *Schiſme*? I anſwer if you will give me leave, ſhe fell by *Idolatry*, and corruption of manners, againſt both which the Prophets were *proteſtants*, 2 King. 17. 13.---ויעד יהוה *God proteſted* againſt them by *his Prophets*. Again the ſame Church reformed in the dayes of *Ezra*, *Nehemiah*, *Zerubbabel*, —— and כנסת הגדולה אנשי *the men of the Great Congregation*, was a *pure* Church; how did it *fall*? not by *Idolatry* as formerly, but by *corruption of life*, unbelief, and rejecting the Word of God for ſuperſtitious *traditions*, untill it became a den of Thieves. You ſee then there are other wayes of a Churches *falling* from its priſtine purity, than thoſe by you inſiſted on. And if you ſhall enquire how it *may* fall, you muſt exclude nothing out of your enquiry, whereby it *may* do ſo, and whereby ſome Churches *have done* ſo. And if you will have my thoughts in this matter, they are, that the beginning of the *fall* of your Church and many others, lay in *unbelief*, corruption of life, conformity to the world, and other ſins that were found in the moſt of its members. And it is a fancy to dream of the *purity* of a Church, in reſpect of its outward order, when the *power* and life of godlineſs is loſt in its members; and a wicked device to ſuppoſe a Church may not be ſeparated from Chriſt by *unbelief*, whileſt it abides in an externall profeſſion of the doctrine of faith. Such a Church though it may *have a name to live*, yet indeed is *dead*, and dead things are *unclean*. We ſpeak of its *purity* and *acceptation* thereon in the ſight of God; neither will men *dead* in treſpaſſes and ſins, be *terrible unto*

any, as an Army with banners, unleſs they are like thoſe in *Lucilius*, who,

Ut pueri infantes credunt ſigna omnia aëna
Vivere & eſſe homines; ſic iſti omnia ficta
Vera putant; credunt ſignis cor ineſſe aheneis.

as *Lactantius* reports him. But you ſay, *If they fall by Idolatry and yet keep any parts of Chriſtianity, they fall by Hereſie.* But why ſo? would you had thought it incumbent on you to give a *reaſon* of what you ſay. Are *Idolatry* and *Hereſie* the ſame? *Tertullian* who of all the old *Eccleſiaſticall* Writers moſt enlargeth the bounds of *Idolatry*, defines it to be *omnis circa omne Idolum famulatus & ſervitus*; *Any Worſhip or ſervice performed in reference to, or about any Idoll.* I do not remember that ever I met with your definition of *Idolatry* in any Author whatever. *Bellarmine* ſeems to place it in *Creaturum æque colere ac Deum*; *to worſhip the creature as much or equally with the Creator*: which deſcription of it, though it be vain and groundleſs, for his *æque* is neither in the Scripture nor any approved Author of old required to the conſtituting of the worſhip of any creature *Idolatrous*, yet is not this *Hereſie* neither, but that which differs from it *toto genere*. We know it to be *cultus religioſus creaturæ exhibitus, any religious Worſhip of that which by nature is not God*: and ſo doth your *Thomas* grant it to be. *Gregory de Valentia* another of your great *Champions* contends, that *tanquam Deo, as unto God*, is to be added unto the definition: As though *religious worſhip* could be given unto *any thing*, and not as *unto God* really and indeed, though not intentionally as to the worſhipper. Where a man gives *religious worſhip*, there he doth *ipſo facto* aſſign a divine eminencie, ſay he what he will to the contrary,

contrary: Neither will his intention of not doing it *as unto God*, any more free him from Idolatry, than an *Adulteress* will be free by not looking on her *Adulterer* as her Husband. I confess he adds afterwards a *distinction* that is of great use for you, and indispensably necessary for your defence; *de Idol. lib. 2 cap. 7.* St *Peter* he tells us insinuates some *worship of Idols, cultum aliquem simulachrorum*, to wit, that of the *holy Images* to be right, or lawfull, when he deterreth believers *ab illicitis Idolorum cultibus, from the unlawfull worship of Idols*; 1 Pet. 4. 3. ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις, This were somewhat indeed, if all *epithetes* were distinguishing, none aggravating or declarative. When *Virgil* said *dulcia mella premes*, Geor. 4. he did not insinuate that there was any *bitter honey*. Nor is it allowable only for *Poets*, to use explaining and declaring *epithetes*; but *Aristotle* allowes it in the best Orators also, so they use not μακροῖς ἢ ἀσήμοις ἢ πυκνοῖς, *long* or *unseasonable* ones, or the same *frequently*: and the use of this here by *Peter* is free from all those vices. When the *Romane Orator* cryed out *ô scelus detestandum, O wickedness to be abhorred*, he did not intend to insinuate that there was a *wickedness not to be abhorred*, or to be approved. But if it will follow hence that your Church is guilty only of *lawfull Idolatry*, I shall not much contend about it. Yet I must tell you, that as the poor woman when the *Physicians* in her sickness told her still that what she complained of was a *good sign*, cryed out ὅτι μοι τἀγαθὰ ἀπόλωλε, *good signes have undone me*; your *lawfull Idolatry* if you take not better heed, will undo you. In the mean time as to the *coincidence* you imagin between *Idolatry* and *Heresie*, I wish you would advise with your *Angelicall Doctor*, who will shew you how they are contradistinct evils,

which he therefore *weighs* in his ſcales, and determines which is the heavieſt, 22ª *q.* 94. *a. ad* 4. The Church in the wilderneſs fell by its προπέτεια, its *making and worſhiping a golden Calfe*, as a representation of the preſence of God. That they kept ſome parts of the Doctrine of Truth entire, is evident from their proclamation of a *feaſt to Jehovah*. Do any men in their wits uſe to ſay this fall was by *Hereſie*, though all agree it was by *Idolatry*? ſo that your Church might fall by *Idolatry* and not fall formally by *Hereſie*, according to the genuine importance of the word, the uſe of it in the Scriptures, or the *definition* given of it by the *Schoolmen*, or any ſober Writer of what ſort ſoever. And here I muſt deſire you to *ſtay* a little, if you intend to take *Proteſtants* along with you: They conſtantly return this Anſwer unto you in the firſt place, and tell you, that your Church is *fallen by Idolatry*; It is fallen in the worſhip which you give unto the *Conſecrated Hoſt*, as you call it, wherein if the Scriptures which call it *bread*, and the Fathers who terme it the *figure of the body of Chriſt*, if Reaſon, and all our *ſenſes* deceive us not, you are as plainely *Idolatrous* as the poor wretches which fall down and worſhip a piece of Red Cloth: So your own *Coſterus* aſſures us, *Enchirid. cap.* 8. *Tolerabilior*, ſaith he, *eſt eorum error, qui pro Deo colunt ſtatuam auream, aut argenteam, aut alterius materiæ imaginem, quomodo Gentiles Deos ſuos venerabantur, vel pannum rubrum in haſtam elevatum, quod narratur de Lappis, vel viva animalia ut quondam Ægyptii, quam eorum qui fruſtum panis colunt. Their errour is more tolerable who worſhip a golden or ſilver Statue, or an Image of any other matter for a God, as the Gentiles worſhipped their Gods, or a ragge of Red Cloth lifted upon a ſpear, as it is reported of the*

the Laplanders, or living Creatures, as did the Egyptians of old, than theirs who worship a piece of bread. This is that which made *Averoes* cry out, *seeing the Christians eat the God whom they worship, let my soul be among the Philosophers.* You do the same in your worship of the *Cross*, which the chiefest among you maintain to be the *same* that is due to Christ himself. And you are in the same path still in the religious adoration you give unto the *blessed Virgin*, your prayers to her, and invocations of her, which abound in all your *books* of Devotion, and generall practice. And what need we mention any particular instances, when you have begun some of your *Conciliary actions*; the greatest solemnities of Christianity amongst you, with *invocation* of her for help and assistance. So did your Councell of *Lateran* joyning with Cardinall *Cajetan* in their opening of the second *Session*, in these words; *Quoniam nihil est quod homo de semetipso sine auxilio opeq; divina possit polliceri, ad Gloriosam ipsam Virginem Dei matrem primum convertam orationem meam. Seeing there is nothing that a man may promise to himself as of himself without divine help and assistance, I will first turn my prayer unto the Glorious Virgin the mother of God.* This was the Doctrine, this the Practice, this the *Idolatry* of your *Lateran Councell.* And again in the 7th Session, *Deipare nostra presidium imploremus; let us pray for the help or protection of our blessed mother of God.* And in the 10th Session of the same Councell, *Stephen* Archbishop of *Patras* prays; *Ut ipsa beata Virgo, Angelorum Domina, fons omnium Gratiarum, quæ omnes Hereses interemit, cujus opera magna reformatio, Concordia Principum, & vera contra Infideles expeditio fieri debet opem ferre dignetur: That the blessed Virgin, the Lady of Angels, the fountain of all Graces,*

who

who destroyeth all heresies, by whose assistance, the great Reformation, the Agreement of Princes, and sincere expedition against the Infidels (the business of that Councell) *ought to be performed, would vouchsafe to help him, that he might*, &c. And thereupon sings this *Hymne* unto her, recorded in the Acts of the *Councell*;

Omnium Splendor decus & perenne
Virginum Lumen, genetrix superni
Gloria humani generis Maria
unica nostri.
Sola Tu Virgo dominaris astris,
Sola Tu Terra Maris atq; Cœli
Lumen, inceptis faveas rogamus
Inclyta nostris.
Ut queam sacros referare sensus
Qui latent chartis niminum severi
Ingredi & celsa, duce te benigna
Mania terra.

O Mary *the beauty, honour and everlasting light of all Virgins, the mother of the Highest, the only glory of mankind; Thou Virgin alone rulest the Stars; Thou alone are the light of Earth, Sea and Heaven; do thou O glorious Lady, wee entreat, prosper my endeavours; That I may unfold the sacred senses which lye hid in the too severe writings* (of the Scripture) *and kindly give me under thy goodness to enter the walls of the heavenly Countreys.* I suppose it cannot be doubted whence the pattern of this *Conciliary* Prayer was taken; it is but an imitation of

Phœbe, Sylvarumq; potens Diana
Lucidum Cœli decus, O colendi
Semper & culti, date quæ precamur
tempore sacro.

Alme

Alme Sol curru nitido diem qui
Promis & celas aliusq; & idem
Nasceris, possis nihil urbe Roma
visere majus.
Rite maturos aperire partus
Lenis Ilithia, tuere matres
Sive tu Lucina probas vocari
seu Genitalis
Diva.

And if this be not plainely to place her in the *Throne* of God I know not what can be imagined so to do. Your worship of *Angels* and of Saints is of the same importance, concerning whom you do well to entitle your *Paragraph, Hero's*; your Doctrine and Practice concerning them, being the very *same* with those of the antient Heathen, in reference unto their *Demons* and *Hero's*. So your own Learned *Vives* confesseth of many of you; in *August. de Civit. Dei, lib.* 28. *cap. ult. Multi Christiani*, saith he, *Divos Divasq; non aliter venerantur quam Deum; nec video in multis quod sit discrimen inter eorum opinionem de Sanctis, & id quod Gentiles putabant de suis Diis. Many Christians worship her and thee Saints, no otherwise than they do God; neither do I see in many things what difference there is between their opinion concerning the Saints, and that which the Heathen thought of their Gods.* And it is known what *Polidore Virgil* before him affirmed to the same purpose: Your Idolatry in the worship of *Images* of all sorts shall be afterwards declared. Be then this a *single* or *mixt* misdemeanour it matters not, a misdemeanour it is, whereby we affirm that the *Roman Church* is *fallen* from its pristine purity. And this we think is a full answer unto your enquiry. We *need* not, you cannot compell us to go one step farther. But our way

is

is plain and invites us. I shall therefore proceed to let you see once again that she is *fallen* by all the wayes you thought meet to confine your enquiry unto.

You proceed, *finding your self puzled, in the third place you lay on load, she fell say you, by Apostasie, Idolatry, Heresie, Schisme, Licentiousness and prophaneness of Life. And in this you do not much unlike the drunken youth, who being bid to hit his Masters finger with his, when he perceived he could not do it, he ran his whole fist against it.* Seriously Sr, you have the worst *success* in your Attempts for a little *wit and merriment* that ever I met with. If you would take my advice, you should not strain your *Genius* for that which it will not afford you: you forget the old rule,

Tu nihil invita dices faciesve Minerva.

Any other *diversion* were better than this which proves so successless: Yet I must confess you deserve well of *pastime*, seeing to serve its *interests* you so often make your self *ridiculous*, as you now do in this pittifull story. And I cannot tell you whether my Answer have *touched your finger* or no, but I am sure, if it be true, it *strikes* your Cause to the *heart*; and I am as sure of the Truth of it, as I am that I am alive. And you see how I am *pusled*, even as he was who cryed *inopem me copia fecit*. Your Church hath *fallen* so many wayes, all so foully and evidently, that it is hard for any man to *chuse* what instance to insist upon, who is called on to *charge* her, as you by your enquiry of them, do on your *Protestant* Readers. And for my part, I had rather you should take your *choyce*, against which of the things mentioned you think your self best able to *defend* her. And may it please you to chuse your *Instance*, if I prove not your Church to have *fallen* by it, I will pro-

promiſe you to become a *Papiſt*. You proceed to your own particulars, and ask, *Did ſhee fall by Apoſtaſie*: to which you ſubjoyn my words, *by a partiall not a totall one*; with your reply, *Good Sr, in this diviſion Apoſtaſie is ſet to expreſs a totall relapſe in oppoſition to Hereſie which is the partiall.* I ſee you have as little mind to be drawn to the conſideration of your *Apoſtaſie*, as of your *Idolatry*; and would fain poſt off all to *Hereſie*, under a corrupt notion of which *terme*, you hope to find ſome ſhelter for your ſelf and your Church, although in vain. But

Verte omnes tete in facies, & contrahe quicquid
Sive animis, ſive arte vales.

You muſt bear the charge of *Apoſtaſie* alſo. For why muſt that needs be the *notion* of theſe termes in the *diviſion* you made, that you now expreſs? Is it from the ſtrict *ſenſe* and importance of the words themſelves, or from the *Scripturall* or *Eccleſiaſticall* uſe of them, or whence is it, that it *muſt be* ſo, and that it *is* ſo? None of theſe will give you any *relief*, or the leaſt countenance unto your fancie. Both ἀποστασία and ἀφεσις are words ἐκ τῶν μέσων, in themſelves of an *indifferent* ſignification, denoting things or acts, *good* or *evill*, according to their accidentall limitations and applications. It is ſaid of ſome ἀποστήσονται τῆς πίστεως, *they will depart from the faith*, 1 Tim. 4. 1. And the ſame Apoſtle ſpeaking of them that name the name of Chriſt, ſayes, *let every one of them depart from iniquity*, ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας, 2 Tim. 2. 19. ſo that the word it ſelf ſignifies no more but a *ſingle and bare departure* from any thing, way, rule, or practice be it *good* or *bad*, wherein a man hath been ingaged, or which he ought to avoid and fly from. And this is the uſe of it in the beſt *Greek* Authors; πολλὰν ἀφιστάσε

are

are such in *Homer* who are *farre distant* or remote on any account from any thing or place. And τὰ πόρρω ἀφεστῶτα in *Aristotle* things very remote. To leave any place, company, thing, *Society*, or Rule, on any cause, is the common use of the word in *Thucydides*, *Plutarch*, *Lucian*, and the rest of their companions in the propriety of that language. *Apostasia* by *Ecclesiasticall* writers, is restrained unto either a backsliding in *Faith subjective* and manners, or a *causeless* relinquishment of any Truth before professed. So the Jews charge *Paul*, Acts 21. 21. ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις, *thou teachest Apostasie* from *Moses* Law. Such also is the nature of αἵρεσις, a speciall *option*, *choyce*, or way in profession of any Truth or Error. So *Paul* calls *Pharisaisme* ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς θρησκείας, Act. 26. 5. the *most exact hereſie* or way of Religion *among the Jews*. And *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom. lib.* 8. calls Christian Religion αἵρεσιν ἀρίστην, the *best Hereſie*. And the great *Constantine* in one of his *Edicts* calls it αἵρεσιν καθολικὴν, the *Catholick or generall Hereſie*; and αἵρεσιν ἁγιωτάτην, the *most holy Hereſie*. The *Latines* also constantly used that word in a sense indifferent. *Cato*, saith *Cicero*, *est in ea hæresi quæ nullum orationis florem sequitur*. The words therefore themselves you see are of an *indifferent* signification, having this difference between them, that the one for the most part is used to signifie the *Relinquishment* of that which a man had *before* embraced, and the other a *choice* or embracing of that which a man had not before received or admitted. And this difference is constantly observed by all *Ecclesiasticall* writers, who afterwards used these words in the worst or an evill sense; so that *Apostasie* in this appropriation of it, denotes the *relinquishment* of any Important Truth or way in Religion, and

Hereſie

Heresie the *choice* or embracement of any new destructive Opinion or Principle or way in the profession thereof. A man then may be an *Apostate* by *partiall Apostasie*, that is depart from the Profession of *some Truth* he had formerly embraced, or the performance of *some duty* which he was engaged in, without being an *Heretick*, or choosing any *new* opinion which he did not before embrace. Thus you signally call a *Monke* that deserts his *Monasticall* Profession an *Apostate*, though he embrace no opinion which is condemned by your Church, or which you think *hereticall*. And a man may be an *Heretick*, that is *choose* and embrace some new false opinion, which he may coyn out of his own imagination, without a direct *renunciation* of any Truth which before he was instructed in. And this is that which I intended, when I told you that your Church is fallen by *partiall Apostasie and by Heresie*. Shee hath *renounced* many of the important *Truths* which the old *Roman* Church once believed and professed, and so is fallen by *Apostasie*. And she hath invented or coyned many *Articles* pretended to be of faith, which the old *Roman* Church never believed, and so is fallen by *Heresie* also. Now what say you hereunto? *Why, good Sr, in this division Apostasie is set to expresse a totall relapse in opposition to Heresie, which is the partiall.* But who gave you warrant or leave so to *set* them? It would it may be somewhat serve your turn, in evading the Charge of *Apostasie*, that lyes against your Church; but, *Good Sr*, will not prove that you may thus confound things for your advantage. *Idolatry* is *Heresie*, and *Apostasie* is *Heresie*, and what not, because you suppose you have found a way to escape the imputation of *Heresie*. I say then yet again in answer to your enquiry,

that

are such in *Homer* who are *farre distant* or remote on any account from any thing or place. And τὰ πόρρω ἀφεστῶτα in *Aristotle* things very remote. To leave any place, company, thing, *Society*, or Rule, on any cause, is the common use of the word in *Thucydides*, *Plutarch*, *Lucian*, and the rest of their companions in the propriety of that language. *Apostasia* by *Ecclesiasticall* writers, is restrained unto either a backsliding in *Faith subjective* and manners, or a *causeless* relinquishment of any Truth before professed. So the Jews charge *Paul*, Acts 21. 21. ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις, *thou teachest Apostasie* from *Moses* Law. Such also is the nature of αἵρεσις, a speciall *option*, *choyce*, or way in profession of any Truth or Error. So *Paul* calls *Pharisaisme* ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς θρησκείας, Act. 26. 5. the *most exact hereſie* or way of Religion *among the Jews*. And *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom. lib.* 8. calls Christian Religion αἵρεσιν ἀρίστην, the *best Hereſie*. And the great *Constantine* in one of his *Edicts* calls it αἵρεσιν καθολικήν, the *Catholick or generall Hereſie*; and ἁγιωτάτην αἵρεσιν, the *most holy Hereſie*. The *Latines* also constantly used that word in a sense indifferent. *Cato*, saith *Cicero*, *est in ea hæresi quæ nullum orationis florem sequitur*. The words therefore themselves you see are of an *indifferent* signification, having this difference between them, that the one for the most part is used to signifie the *Relinquishment* of that which a man had *before* embraced, and the other a *choice* or embracing of that which a man had not before received or admitted. And this difference is constantly observed by all *Ecclesiasticall* writers, who afterwards used these words in the worst or an evill sense; so that *Apostasie* in this appropriation of it, denotes the *relinquishment* of any Important Truth or way in Religion, and

Hereſie

Heresie the *choice* or embracement of any new destructive Opinion or Principle or way in the profession thereof. A man then may be an *Apostate* by *partiall Apostasie*, that is depart from the Profession of *some Truth* he had formerly embraced, or the performance of *some duty* which he was engaged in, without being an *Heretick*, or chooſing any *new* opinion which he did not before embrace. Thus you ſignally call a *Monke* that deſerts his *Monaſticall* Profeſſion an *Apoſtate*, though he embrace no opinion which is condemned by your Church, or which you think *hereticall*. And a man may be an *Heretick*, that is *chooſe* and embrace ſome new falſe opinion, which he may coyn out of his own imagination, without a direct *renunciation* of any Truth which before he was inſtructed in. And this is that which I intended, when I told you that your Church is fallen by *partiall Apoſtaſie and by Heresie*. Shee hath *renounced* many of the important *Truths* which the old *Roman* Church once believed and profeſſed, and ſo is fallen by *Apoſtaſie*. And ſhe hath invented or coyned many *Articles* pretended to be of faith, which the old *Roman* Church never believed, and ſo is fallen by *Hereſie* alſo. Now what ſay you hereunto? *Why, good Sr, in this diviſion Apoſtaſie is ſet to expreſs a totall relapſe in oppoſition to Hereſie, which is the partiall.* But who gave you warrant or leave ſo to *ſet* them? It would it may be ſomewhat ſerve your turn, in evading the Charge of *Apoſtaſie*, that lyes againſt your Church, but, *Good Sr*, will not prove that you may thus confound things for your advantage. *Idolatry* is *Hereſie*, and *Apoſtaſie* is *Hereſie*, and what not, becauſe you ſuppoſe you have found a way to eſcape the imputation of *Hereſie*. I ſay then yet again in anſwer to your enquiry,

that

that your Church is fallen by *Apostasie*, in her *relinquishment* of many important truths, and neglect of many necessary duties, which the old *Roman Church* embraced and performed. That these may be the more evident unto you, I shall give you some few instances of your *Apostasie*, desiring only that you would grant me, that the *primitive Church* of *Rome* believed and faithfully retained the doctrine of truth, wherein from the Scripture it was instructed.

That Church believed expressly, that all they *who die in the Lord do rest from all their labours*, Rev. 14. 8. which truth you have forsaken, by sending many of them into the flames of *Purgatory*.

It believed, that the *sufferings of this life are not worthy of the glory that shall be revealed in us*, Rom. 8.18. Your Church is otherwise minded, asserting in our works and sufferings a *merit* of, and condignity unto the glory that shall be received.

It believed, that *we were saved freely, by grace, by faith, which is not of our selves, but the gift of God, not by works, lest any one should boast*, Eph 2.8. Tit. 3.5. and therefore *besought the Lord not to enter into judgement with them, because in his sight no flesh could be justified*, Psal.130.4. 143 2. And you are *apostatized* from this part of their faith.

It believed, that Christ *was once only offered*, Heb. 10 12. and that it could not be that *he should often offer himself, because then he must have often* suffered and died, *Heb.*9.25. Which faith of theirs you are departed from.

It believed, that *we have one only Mediatour and Intercessour with God*, 1 Tim. 2. 5. 1 Joh. 2. 2. Wherein also you have renounced their perswasion; as likewise you have done in what it professed, that we may *invocate only him, in whom we do believe*, Rom.10.14.

It,

It believed, that the *Command to abstain from Meats and Marriage, was the doctrine of Devils,* 1 Tim. 4. 1, 2. Do you abide in the same faith?

It believed, that *Every soul* without exception, *was to be subject to the higher Powers,* Rom. 13. 1. You will not walk in the steps of their faith herein.

It believed, that all *Image-worship was forbidden,* Exod. 20. And whether you abide in the same *perswasion,* we shall afterwards examine. And many more instances of the like kind, you may at any time be minded of.

You hast to that you would fain be at, which will be found as little to your purpose, as those whose consideration you so carefully avoid. You say, *Did she fall by Heresie in adhering to any errour in Faith, contrary to the approved doctrine of the Church? Here you smile seriously, and tell me, that, since I take the Roman and Catholick Church to be one, she could not indeed adhere to any thing, but what she did adhere unto. S^r, I take them indeed to be one: but here I speak* ad hominem, *to one that doth not take them so. And then, if indeed the Roman Church had ever swerved in faith, as you say she has, and be her self as another ordinary particular Church, as you say she is, then might you find some one or other more generall Church, if any there were, to judge her; some Oecumenicall Councell to condemn her; some Fathers, either Greek and Latin, expresly to write against her, as Protestants now do; some or other grave Authority to censure her; or at least some company of Believers, out of whose body she went, and from whose faith she fell. None of which, since you are not able to assign,* (wherein you have spoken more rightly, than you were aware of; for, not to be able to assign none of them, infers at least an ability to assign some, if not all of them)

them) *my Query remains unanswered, and the Roman still as flourishing a Church as ever she was.*

Answ. 1. You represent my Answer lamely. I desire the Reader to consult it in the *Animadversions*, pag. 66, 67, 68. What you have taken notice of, discovers only your *sinenesse*, in making *Heresie* an adherence to an errour in faith, contrary to the *doctrine of the Church*; and your selves *the Church*, whereby you must needs be secured from *Heresie*, though you should adhere to the most *hereticall* Principles that ever were broached in the world. But nothing of all this, as I have shewed, will be allowed you. 2. As we have seen some of the Reasons, why you were so unwilling to try the *Cause* of your Church, on the heads of *Idolatry* and *Apostasie*; so here you discover a sufficient Reason, why you have passed over your other head of *Schism*, in silence. You avow your self one of the most *schismaticall Principles*, that were ever adhered unto by any professing the name of Christ. *The Roman Church and the Catholick are with you one and the same.* Is not this *Petilianus* his, in *parte Donati*; nay *Basilides* his, ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι πάντες κύνες καὶ ὗες. *Epiphan. Heref.* 4. *We only are men, all others are Dogs and Swine.* *Macte virtute!* If this be not to *shew moderation*, and to persue *reconciliation*, at once to shut out all men but your selves from the *Church* here, and consequently *Heaven* hereafter, what can be thought so to be? In earnest Sr, you may talk what you please of *moderation*, but whilest you avow this one wretched *schismaticall* Principle, you do your endeavour to exclude all true *Christian moderation* out of the world. 3. Why do you conclude, that your *Query* is not answered? Suppose *one* Question could not be answered, doth it necessarily

rily follow that *another* cannot? I suppose, you take notice that this is *another* Question, and not that at first proposed, as I told you before. Your first enquiry was about your *Churches crime*, this is about her *conviction* and condemnation; and your *Conclusion* hath no strength in it, but what is built on this unquestionable Maxim, that, *None ever offended, who was not publickly judged*; as though there were no *Harlot* in the world but those that have been *carted*. It is enough Sr, that her condition is *sub judice*, as it will be, whether you or I will or no; and that there is not evidence wanting for her *conviction*, nor ever was since her fall, though it may be it hath not at all times been so publickly managed. And yet so vain is your *triumphant* Conclusion, that we rest not here, but prove also that she hath been of old judged and condemned, as you will hear anon.

And thus I have once more given you an *Answer* to your *enquiry*, how your Church *fell*; namely, that she hath done so by all the wayes and means, by which it is *possible* for a Church to fall. She failed under the just hand of God, when the persons of that *Urbick Church* were extirpated, partly by others, but totally by *Totilas*; as the *Brittish* Church in *England fell* by the sword of the *Saxons*. She hath fallen by *Idolatry*, and *corruption of life*, as did the Church of the *Jews* before the Captivity. She hath fallen by her *relinquishment* of the written Word, as the only rule of faith and worship, and by adhering to the *uncertain traditions* of men, as did the Church of the Jews after their return from captivity. She hath fallen by *Apostasie*, in forsaking the profession of many *important truths* of the Gospel, as the Church of the *Galatians* did for a season, in their relinquishment of the doctrine of Justification by

grace alone. She hath fallen by *Hereſie*, in coyning new Articles of faith, and impoſing them on the *conſciences* of the Diſciples of Chriſt, as the *Montaniſts* did with their new *Paraclete*, and rigid obſervances. She hath fallen by *Schiſme* in her ſelf, as the *Judaical* Church did when divided into *Eſſenes*, *Sadduces*, and *Phariſees*: ſetting up *Pope* againſt *Pope*, and *Councell* againſt *Councell*, continuing in her inteſtine broils for ſome ages together; and *from all* others, by the wretched Principle, but-now avowed by you, as the *Donatiſts* did of old. She hath fallen by Ambition, in the *Hildebrandine* Principle, aſſerting a *Soveraignty in the Pope* over the Kings and Potentates of the earth, whereof I can give you no precedent inſtance, unleſs it be of him, who claimed the *Kingdomes of the world* to be his own, and boaſted that he diſpoſed of them at his pleaſure, *Mat.*4. And now I hope you will not take it in *ill part*, that I have given you a plain Anſwer unto your Queſtion, which, as I ſuppoſe, was propoſed unto us for that end and purpoſe.

But although theſe things are evident and ſufficiently *proved*, yet I ſee nothing will ſatisfie you, unleſs we produce *teſtimonies* of *former times*, to manifeſt that your Church hath been *arraigned*, *judged*, condemned, written againſt, by *Fathers*, *Councils*, or other Churches. Now though this be ſomewhat an unreaſonable expectation in you, and that which I am no way bound unto by the *Law* of our Diſcourſe to ſatisfie you in; yet to prevent for the future ſuch Evaſions, as you have made *uſe* of on all occaſions in your *Epiſtle*, I ſhall in a few pregnant and unqueſtionable *Inſtances*, give you an account both *when*, *how*, and by *whom* the falls of your Church have been obſerved, reproved, *condemned*, and written againſt;

againſt. Only unto what ſhall be diſcourſed unto this purpoſe, I deſire liberty to premiſe theſe *three* things, which I ſuppoſe will be granted.

Dabitur ignis tamen, etſi ab inimicis petam.

The firſt is, that, *What is by any previouſly condemned, before the embracing and practice of it, is no leſs condemned by them, than if the practice had preceded their condemnation.* Though you ſhould ſay that your avowing of a *condemned* errour, would make it *no* errour; yet you cannot ſay that it will render it *not* condemned: for that which is done, cannot be undone, ſay you what you will.

Secondly, that, *Where any opinion or practice in Religion, which is embraced and uſed by your Church, is condemned and written againſt, that then your Church which ſo embraceth and uſeth it, is condemned and written againſt.* For neither do Proteſtants write againſt your Church, or *condemn* it, on any other account, but of your *opinions* and practices; and you require but ſuch a writing and condemnation, as you complain of amongſt them.

Thirdly, I deſire you to take notice, that I do not this, as though it were *neceſſary to the ſecurity and defence of the Cauſe which we maintain againſt you.* It is abundantly ſufficient and ſatisfactory unto our *conſciences*, in your caſting us out from your communion, that all the *wayes* whereby we ſay your Church is *fallen* from her priſtine purity, are judged and condemned in the *Scripture*, the Word of truth; whither we *appeal* for the laſt determination of the differences between us. Theſe things being premiſed, to prevent ſuch *evaſions* as you have accuſtomed your ſelf unto, I ſhall, as briefly as I can, give you ſomewhat of that, which you have now *twice* called for.

1. Your Principle and Practiſe *in impoſing upon all Perſons and Churches a neceſſity of the obſervation of your Rites and Ceremonies, Cuſtomes and Traditions, caſting them out of Communion who refuſe to ſubmit unto this your great Principle of all the Schiſms in Europe*, was contradicted, written againſt, *condemned* by Councels and Fathers, in the very firſt inſtance that ever you gave of it. Be pleaſed to conſider that this concerns the very *Life* and Being of your Church: For if you may not impoſe your *Conſtitutions*, obſervances, and cuſtomes upon all others, *actum eſt*, there is an end of your *preſent* Church State. Let us ſee then how this was thought of in the dayes of old: *Victor* the Biſhop of *Rome*, *An. Dom.* 96. condemns and excommunicates the Churches of *Aſia*, becauſe they would not joyn with him in the Celebration of *Eaſter* preciſely on the Lords day. Did this practiſe eſcape *uncontrolled*? He was written againſt, by the great *Irenæus*, and reproved that he had caſt out of Communion τὰς ὅλας Ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ, *Whole Churches of God*, for a trivial cauſe. His fact alſo was condemned in the juſtification of thoſe Churches, by a *Councell* in *Paleſtine*, where *Theophilus* preſided; and another in *Aſia*, called together for the ſame purpoſe by *Polycrates*; *Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. lib.* 5. *cap.* 22, 23, 24, 25. This is an early inſtance of a conſiderable *Fall* in your Church, and an open oppoſition by *Councels* and *Fathers* made unto it. And do not you, Sr, deceive your ſelf, as though the fact of *Victor* were alone concerned in this cenſure of *Irenæus* and others. The Principle before mentioned, which is the very *life* and ſoul of your Church, is condemned in it. It was done alſo in a repetition of the ſame Inſtance attempted here in *England* by you, when *Auſtine* that came from *Rome* would have impoſed

posed on the *British* Churches the observation of *Easter* according to the custome of the *Roman* Church; the *Bishops* and *Monks* of these Churches, not only rejected your *Custome*, but the Principle also from whence the attempt to impose it on them did proceed; protesting, that they owned no subjection to the *Bishop of Rome*, *nor other regard, than what they did to every good Christian.* Concil. Anglican. p. 188.

2. Your Doctrine and Practise of *forcing men by carnall weapons, corporall penalties, tortures, and terrors of death, unto the embracement of your profession, and actually destroying and taking away the lives of them that persist in their dissent from you*, is condemned by *Fathers* and *Councels*, as well as by the Scriptures, and the light of Nature its self. It is condemned by *Tertullian*, Apol. cap. 23. *Videte*, saith he, *ne & hoc ad irreligiositatis elogium concurrat, adimere libertatem Religionis, & interdicere optionem Divinitatis, ut non liceat mihi colere quod velim, sed cogar colere quod nolim*; with the like expressions, in *twenty* other places. All this externall compulsion he ascribes unto *profaneness*. So doth *Clemens Alexand. Stromat.* 8. So also did *Lactantius*; all consenting in that Maxim of *Tertullian*, *Lex nova non se vindicat ultore gladio: The Law of Christ revengeth not its self with a punishing sword.* The *Councell* of *Sardis*, *Epist. ad Alexand.* expressly affirms, that they dissuaded the *Emperour from interposing his Secular power to compell them that dissented.* And you are fully condemned in a *Canon* of a Councell at *Toledo*, Cap. de Judæ. distinc. 45. *Præcipit sancta Synodus, nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre; cui enim vult Deus misereatur, & quem vult indurat. The holy Synod commandeth, that none hereafter shall by force be*

compelled to the faith: for God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. *Athanasius* in his Epistle *ad Solitar.* falls heavily on the *Arians*, that they began first to *compell* men to their *heresie*, by *force*, prisons, and punishments; whence he concludes of their Sect, *atq; ita seipsam quam non sit pia nec Dei cultrix manifestat: it evidently declares it self hereby, to be neither pious, nor to have any reverence of God.* In a Book that is of some credit with you, namely *Clemens* his *Constitutions*, you have this amongst other things for your comfort, τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀφῆκεν ἐλεύθερον, οὐ προσκαίρῳ θανάτῳ δικάζων, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑτέρᾳ καταστάσει λογοθετῶν αὐτό. *Christ left men the power of their wills free* (in this matter), *not punishing them with death temporall, but calling them to give an account in another world.* And *Chrysostome* speaks to the same purpose on *Joh 6.* Ἐρωτᾷ λέγων, Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν, ὃ περ πᾶσαν ἦν ἀφαιρῶντος βίαν καὶ ἀνάγκην. *He asked them saying, Will you also go away? which is the Question of one rejecting all force and necessity.* *Epiphanius* gives it, as the character of the semi-Arrians, τοὺς τὴν ἀλήθειαν διδάσκοντας διώκουσιν, οὐκ ἐν λόγοις βουλόμενοι ἀναστρέπειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγχθρίαις, καὶ πολέμοις, καὶ μαχαίραις παραδιδόντες τοὺς ὀρθῶς πιστεύοντας. λυμὴν γὰρ οὐ μιᾷ πόλει καὶ χώρᾳ εἰργάσαντο ἀλλὰ πολλαῖς. *They persecute them that teach the Truth, not confuting them with words, but delivering them that believe aright to hatreds, wars and swords, having now brought destruction not to one City or Countrey alone, but to many.* Neither can you relieve your selves, by answering that they were *true believers* whom they persecuted; you punish *Hereticks* and Schismaticks only, for they thought and said the same of themselves, which you assert in your own behalf. So *Salvian* informs

us,

us, *Haretici sunt, sed non scientes, deniq; apud nos sunt Haretici, apud se non sunt. Nam in tantum se & Catholicos judicant, ut nos ipsos titulo Haretica pravitatis infament; quod ergo illi nobis sunt, & hoc nos illis.* They are hereticks, but they know it not; they are hereticks unto us, but not unto themselves: for they so far judge themselves to be Catholick, that they condemn us for the guilt of Heresie: So then, what they are to us, that we are to them. Especially was your whole practice in this matter solemnly condemned in the Case of *Priscillianus*, recorded by *Sulpitius Severus* in the end of his second Book, the only Instance that *Bellarmine* could fix upon in all Antiquity for the *putting* of any men to death upon the account of Religion; for the other whom he mentions, he confesseth himself to have been a *Magitian*. *Ithacius*, with some other Bishops his Associates, procured *Maximus* the Tyrant to put *Priscillianus* a *Gnosticke*, with some others, to death; and to banish some of their followers. What saith the *Historian* thereon: *Hoc modo*, saith he, *homines haec indignissimi pessimo exemplo necati, aut exilio mulctati*; *On this manner, were those unworthy wretches either slain or punished by banishment, by a very evil precedent.* And what was the success of this zeal? *Non solum*, saith he, *non repressa est haresis, sed confirmata & latius propagata*: *The heresie was so farre from being repressed by it, that it was the more confirmed and propagated.* And what ensued hereupon in the Church its self? *Inter nostros perpetuum discordiarum bellum exarsit, quod jam per quindecim annos foedis dissensionibus agitatum nullo modo sopiri poterat. Et nunc cum maximè discordiis Episcoporum turbari & misceri omnia cernerentur, cunctáq; per eos odio aut gratia, metu, inconstantia, invidia, factione, avaritia, arrogantia, somno, desidia essent depravata*

vata; postremo plures adversum paucos benè consulentes, insanis consiliis & pertinacibus studiis certabant. Inter hæc plebs Dei, & optimus quisque, probro atq; ludibrio habebatur: With which words he shuts up his Ecclesiasticall story. *Amongst ours, a lasting war of discord was kindled, which, after it hath now for fifteen years been carried on with shamefull contentions, can by no means be allayed. And now especially when all things appear to be troubled and perverted by the discord of the Bishops, and that all things are depraved by them through hatred, favour, fear, inconstancy, envy, faction, covetousness, pride, sleepiness and sloth; the most with mad counsels and pertinacious endeavours opposing themselves to the few that are better advised. Amongst all these things, the people of God and every honest man, is become a reproach and scorn.* Thus that *Historian* complaining of the consequents of this proceeding. But good men left not the matter so: *Martinus Turonensis* presently refuseth all communion with them who had any hand in the death or *banishment* of the persons mentioned. So doth *Ambrose* declare himself to have done, *Epist.* 27. as did the rest of the sober godly Bishops of those dayes. At length both *Ithacius* and *Idacius*, the promoters of this work, were solemnly *excommunicated*, though one of them had before for very shame foregone his *Bishoprick*. See *Prosp. Chron.* 389. and *Isidore de Viris Illustribus.* So that here also the judgment and practice of your Church which she is fallen into, is publickly condemned and written against, 1300 years ago. Should I insist on all the Testimonies that of this kind might be produced,

Antè diem clauso componet vesper olympo

than I could make an end of them. I have added this Instance

Instance to the former, as knowing them to be the two great *pillars* on which the *tottering fabrick* of your Church is raised; and which if they were removed, the whole of it would quickly fall to the ground: and you see how long ago, they were both publickly condemned.

3. Your Papall Oecumenicall Supremacy hath two main Branches, 1. *Your Popes Spirituall Power over all Persons and Churches, in the things of Religion.* 2. *His Power over Emperors, Kings, and Potentates,* in reference unto Religion; or, as you speak, *in ordine ad spiritualia.* The first your Church *stumbled* into by many degrees, from the dayes of *Victor*, who made the first notable *halt* to this purpose. The latter you *stumbled* into in the dayes of *Gregory* the seventh, or *Hildebrand.* It were endless to declare how this *fall* of your Church hath been declared, written against, opposed, condemned by *Churches, Councels, Fathers,* Princes, and learned men in all Ages. Some few evidences to this purpose, to satisfie your request, I shall direct you unto: It was *written* against and condemned by *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, and that in a Councell at *Carthage, an.* 258. upon an attempt made by *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, looking in some small degree towards that *usurped Supremacy*, which afterwards was attained unto. You may, if you please, there see *him* rebuked, and the practice of your Church condemned. The same *Cyprian* had done no less before, in reference unto some actings of *Cornelius* the predecessor of *Stephen*, *Epist. ad Cornel.* Though the pretensions of *Cornelius* and *Stephen* were modest in comparison of your present vast Claim; yet the Churches of God in those dayes could not *bear* them. It is prejudged in the most famous *Councell* of *Nice*, which assigned bounds

bounds unto the Jurisdiction of Bishops, giving to severall of them equall Authority, *Can.* 6. Τὰ ἀρχαῖα κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πεντα[πόλει, ὅτι τὸν] Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπεὶδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστι. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. *Let the ancient Customes be observed, that, as to* Egypt, Lybia, *and* Pentapolis, *the Bishop of* Alexandria *have power over them, (or the Churches in them) for so is the custome of the Bishop of* Rome, (that is, to have power over the adjoyning Churches;) *likewise about* Antioch, *and in other Provinces, that the ancient Rights of the Churches be preserved.* Your *Great Pope* whom you so frequently call the *Pastor of Christendome*, was here but ὁ ἐν τῇ ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπος, *The Bishop in the City or Church of* Rome, or of the Church in the City of *Rome.* And bounds are assigned unto the Authority which he claimed by custome, as to his of *Alexandria* and *Antioch.* It is true, the Church of *Alexandria* hath some power assigned, ascribed, or granted unto it, above other Churches of *Egypt*, *Lybya*, and *Pentapolis*, for a warranty whereof, the usage of the *Roman* Church in reference unto her neighbour Churches, is made use of: which to deal freely with you, and to tell you my private thoughts, was a confirmation of a *disorder* by your example, which you were from that day forward seldome wanting to give plenty of. So to this purpose, *Concil. Antioch. Can.* 13, and 15. *an.* 341. *Concil. Constantinop. Can.* 2. *an.* 381. But this *Canon* of the *Nicene* Fathers, openly condemneth and is perfectly destructive of your at present claimed Supremacy. Three Councels together in *Africk*, within the space of *twenty years*, warned your Church of *her fall* into this *Heresie*, and opposed

oppoſed her attempts for the promotion of it. The firſt at *Carthage*, *an.* 407. which forbids all *appeals unto any beyond the Sea*; which *Rome* was to them in *Africk*, no leſs than it is unto us in *England*. The next was the ſecond *Milevitan*, *an.* 416. where the ſame *prohibition* is revived with expreſs reſpect unto the *See of* Rome, as *Binius* acknowledgeth. The ſame order is again aſſerted by another Councell in *Africk*, wherein the pretenſions of *Boniface* unto ſome kind of *ſuperintendency* over other Churches, are ſorely reproved, and his way of proſecuting his attempt by pretended *Canons* of the Councell of *Nice*, after great pains taken and charge diſburſed in the diſcovery of the *forgery*, cenſured and condemned. All theſe teſtimonies of the condemnation of this *fall* of yours by Fathers and Councels you have gathered unto your hand in the *Cod. Can. Conc. Afric.* and by *Binius*, with others. Alſo the ſubſtance of all theſe Canons of *Provinciall Synods* is confirmed in the fourth Chapter of the Decree of the third *Oecumenicall* Councell at *Epheſus*; *an.* 431. *Act.* 7. Ἔφος ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ, σώζεσθαι ἑκάστῃ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀβίαστα τὰ αὐτῇ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπάρξαντα, κατὰ τὸ πάλαι κεκρατῆσαν ἔθος. *It ſeemeth good to the holy and generall Councell, that every Province retain its Rights, pure and inviolate, which, according unto ancient cuſtome, it had from the beginning.* The Decree, I confeſs, was purpoſely framed againſt the Biſhop of *Antioch*, who had taken on him to ordain Biſhops in *Cyprus* out of his Province; but it is built on that generall Reaſon, which expreſly condemns the *Roman* pretenſions to an unlimited Supremacy. The great and famous Councell of *Chalcedon*, *an.* 451. condemned the ſame *Hereſie*, and plainly overthrew the whole *foundation* of your *Papall*

pall plea, *Act.* 15. *Can.* 18. as the Canons of that Councell are collected by *Balsamon* and *Zonaras*; though some of them, with intolerable *partiality*, would separate this and some others, from the Body of the *Canons* of that Councell, giving them a place by themselves. The Decree contains the *Reasons* of the Councel's assigning priviledges next unto, and equall with, the *Roman*, unto the *Constantinopolitan* Church; Τῷ θείῳ, say they, τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀπέδωκαν τὰ πρεσβεῖα. *The Fathers* (our Predecessors) *granted priviledges to the See of ancient* Rome, *because that was the Imperiall City.* Do you see from *whence* proceeded all the priviledges of the *Roman throne*? meerly from the *grants* and *concessions* of former Bishops; and I wish they had been liberall only of what was their own. And what was the reason of their so doing? *Because the City was Imperiall*; in which one sentence, both their *Supremacy* and the grounds of it are discarded and virtually condemned; for their pretensions are utterly inconsistent with this *Synodicall* determination. They proceed: for the same reason, Τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ρώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ συγκλήτου τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ρώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς. *They* (the hundred and fifty Bishops) *assigned the same or equal Priviledges unto the holy See of new* Rome, *rightly determining that the City which is honoured with the Empire and Senate, should enjoy equal Priviledges in things Ecclesiasticall with the ancient Queen-*Rome, or *Rome* regent of old. Is not your present *Supremacy* here sufficiently condemned, and that by as famous a *Councell* as ever the Christian world enjoyed? And it will not avail you, that you

fell

fell into this *Heresie* fully afterwards, and not *before* the determination of this Councell; for he that falls into an *Heresie* after the determination of a Councell, is no less condemned therein, than he that *fell* into it before, and gave occasion to the Sentence; yea his guilt is the greater of the two, because he despised the Sentence which he knew, which the other it may be neither did, nor could foresee. I gave you an Instance before, how it was condemned and written against by the *Brittish* Church here in this Island, and many more Instances of the same nature might be added.

The *Hildebraudine* branch of your Supremacy, I mean the power that you challenge over *Kings* and Potentates, *in ordine ad Spiritualia*, which having made some progress by insensible degrees, was enthroned by Pope *Gergory* the seventh, hath as little escaped opposition, censure, and *condemnation*, as any *Heresie* whereinto your Church is fallen. This *Gregory* may be accounted the chief Father of this *Heresie*, for he licked the unshapen Monster into that *terrible* form, wherein it hath since ranged about in the earth. What this mans Principles and Practices were, I shall not desire you to learn of Cardinall *Benno*, whom yet I have reason to judge the more impartiall Writer of the two, but of Cardinall *Baronius*, who makes it his business to extoll him to the skies: *Facit eum apud nos Deum, virtutes narrat*, he makes *almost a god of him*, or at least θεον ανδρα, as *Socrates* tells us the *Lacedamonians* called an excellent man, *Plato in Menn.* The chief Kingdoms of *Europe*, as *England* and *Spain*, with *Sicilia* and *Sardinia*, and sundry other Principalities, he claimed as his own unquestionable *fee*. The *Empire* he accounted his proper Care, making the deposing of

Emperors

Emperors much of his busines. The Principles he proceeded upon, the same *Cardinall* informs us of, in his Annals *ad* [illegible] 1076. *n.* 30. And he hath done well to record them, that they might be preserved *In perpetuam rei memoriam*, that we might learn what your great Father exercised himself about,

Dum succus pecori & lac subducitur agnis,

whilest the poor *sheep* famished for want of knowledge and instruction. They are called *Dictata Papæ*, and *ex tripode* we may not doubt, being in number twenty seven, whereof I shall mind you of a few. The first is, *Quod Romana Ecclesia à solo Domino sit fundata*; *That the Roman Church was founded by the Lord alone.* 2. *Quod solus Romanus Pontifex jure vocatur Universalis*; *That the Roman Bishop is rightfully called Universall.* So some think indeed, ever since Pope *Gregory* the first taught them, that he who assumed that Title, was a forerunner of Antichrist. 3. *Quod ille solus possit deponere Episcopos, vel reconciliare*; *That he alone can depose Bishops, or restore them*; which agrees well with the practice of all the Councels from that of *Antioch*, which deposed *Paulus Samosatenus*. 7. *Quod illi soli licet, pro temporis necessitate, novas leges condere*; *That he alone as necessity requires can make new Laws.* Let him proceed; 8. *Quod solus possit uti Imperialibus insignis*; *He alone can use Imperiall ensigns.* It is a great kindness in him doubtless to lend them to any of his neighbours, or rather subject Kings. 9. *Quod solius Papæ pedes omnes Principes deosculentur*; *That it is the Pope alone whose feet all Princes may or ought to kiss.* Yea and it is a kindness if he *kick* not their Crowns from their heads with his foot, as one did our King *John's*; or tread upon their necks, as another

ther did on the Emperor *Frederick's*. 11. *Quod unicum sit nomen in mundo, Papa scilicet*, That there is only one name in the world, to wit, that of the Pope: no other name it seems given under heaven. Once more, 12. *Quod illi liceat, Imperatores deponere*, That it is lawfull for him to depose Emperours. I hope you will not be offended at the calling over these *Heresies*, because the so doing is not suited to our present design. I took them out of your *Cardinal Baronius*, in the place above quoted, who hath placed them as on a pillar, V. D. P. L. P. *where they may be easily read by all men*. And that you may not think that these were the *Heresies* of *Gregory* alone, the same *Baronius* affirms that these *Dictates* were confirmed in a *Synod at* Rome, whereby they became the Heresies of your whole Church. Did *Peter* thus feed the sheep of Christ? seeing *Pasce oves meas*, is the great pretence for all these exorbitances. Alas

Hic alienus oves custos bis mulget in hora

all this is but the *shearing*, *milking*, and *slaying* of a stranger, the shepherds being driven into corners. But have these noisome *Heresies* of your Church, think you, passed without controll? Was she not judged, *censured*, *written* against, and condemned in the person of her chief Pastor? You must be a very stranger unto all History, if you can imagine any such thing. A Councell assembled by the Emperor at *Worms* in *Germany*, reckons up the miscarriages of this *Hildebrand*, and pronounceth him *deposed*, with all those that adhered unto him. Another Synod, *an.* 1080. at *Brixia* in *Bavaria*, condemns him also for the same causes. All the *Heroick* Potentates of *Europe*, especially the *Emperors* of *Germany*, the Kings of *England*, and *France*, with whole Assem-

blies of their Clergy, have alwayes opposed and condemned this branch of your Supremacy. And to this purpose, hundreds of their *Laws*, Decrees, Edicts, and Declarations, are at this day extant.

4. Your *Pope's Personall Infallibility* with the requisite Qualifications, is another *Heretical* Opinion that your Church hath fallen by. And herein you are *αὐτοκατάκριτοι*, *condemned of your selves*, and we need no further witness against you; you have been often taken *ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ*, *in the very fact*. I know there is an Opinion, secretly *advancing* amongst some of you, whereby you would cast out of the bounds of your defence this *Personall Infallibility* of your *Pope*; but we have no more reason to esteem that opinion the *Doctrine* of your Church, than we have to conclude that the *Jesuits* new Position, asserting him *Infallible in matter of fact*, is so. And though I know not perfectly, what your opinion is in this matter; yet I may take a time to shew how utterly *unserviceable* unto your purpose the new way of the explication of *Infallibility* is. For it hath but these two generall inconveniences attending it. First, that it is *not* the opinion of your Church; Secondly, if that be the *only* Infalliblity we are to rest on, the whole *claim* of your Church, and its interest therein, falls to the ground; both which I hope to have an opportunity to manifest. In the mean time, we take that for the *Doctrine* of your Church which is declared by its self so to be, which is explained and defended by her most famous Champions. And indeed, you in your *Fiat*, assert, as I have shewed, the Pope (Personally) to be an *unerring* guide, which is that we enquire after. *Bellarmine* tells us, that all Catholicks agree in these two things: 1. *Pontificem, cum Generali Concilio, non posse errare in condendis decretis fidei, vel generalibus praecepti*is

ceptis morum; *That the Pope with a generall Councell cannot erre in making decrees of faith, or generall precepts concerning manners.* 2. *Pontificem solum, vel cum suo particulari Concilio, aliquid in re dubia statuentem, sive errare possit sive non, esse ab omnibus fidelibus obedienter audiendum*; *All believers must willingly obey the Pope, either alone, or with his particular Councell, determining in doubtfull matters, whether he may erre or no.* I confess, if this be so, and he must be obeyed, whether he do *right* or *wrong*, whether he teacheth *truly* or *falsly*, it is to no great purpose to talk of his *Infallibility*; for, follow him we *must* whither ever he leads us, though it should be to Hell. And the Catholick Proposition that he asserts himself, is, that, *Summus Pontifex, cum totam Ecclesiam docet in his quæ ad fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest.* *The Pope when he teacheth the whole Church, can in no Case erre in those things which appertain unto faith.* *De Rom. Pontif. lib.* 4. *cap.* 2, 3. What a Blind that is, *of teaching the whole Church*, children can see. The *Pope* can no way *teach the whole Church*, but as he declares his opinion, or judgement, which may be *divulged* unto many, as those of another man. Let us see then, how well they have made good this their *Infallibility*; and how well their judgement hath been approved of by the Church of old. I will not here mind you of the Decree fathered on *Clement*, wherein he determines that *all things among Christians ought to be common*; *and, among them, wives*; because I know, it is *falsly* imposed on him, though you may be *justly* charged with it, who are the Authors of those forgeries whereof that is a part. Nor shall I rake the *Epistles* which you ascribe unto divers of the Ancient *Bishops* of *Rome*, that are full of ignorance, errors, and pitti-

full non-sence; because they are, questionless, *Pseudepigrapheall*, though you who *own* them, may be justly charged with their follies. Nor will I much insist on the Testimony of *Tertullian* in his Book against *Praxeas*, that the Bishop of *Rome* owned the Prophesies of *Montanus*, untill *Praxeas* perswaded him to the Contrary; because, it may be, you will say, that perhaps *Tertullian* spake partially in favour of a *Sect* whereunto he was himself addicted; though, for ought I know, he is as sufficient a Witness in *matter of fact*, as any one man upon the Roll of Antiquity. But what say you to *Marcellinus*? Did he not sacrifice to Idols, which, according unto you, is *a mixt misdemeanour in faith and manners*, (*Con. Tom. 1. Vita Marcell.*) and therefore certainly a shrewd impeachment of his *Infallibility*: and was he not *judged* for it? What think you of *Liberius*, did he not subscribe to *Arianism*? *Sozomen* tells you expressly that he did so, *Lib. 4. cap.* 15. And so doth *Athanasius Epist. ad Solitarios*, giving the reason why he did so, namely out of fear. And so doth *Hierome* both in *Script. Eccles. Fortunat.* and in *Euseb. Chron.* *Pope Honorius* was solemnly condemned for a *Monothelite* Heretick in the sixth generall Councell, *Act.* 12, 13. which Sentence was afterwards ratified by your own *darling*, the second of *Nice Act.* 3 and *Act.* 7. and is mentioned in a decretall Epistle of Pope *Leo* the second. So Infallible was he during his *life*, so infallible was he thought to be when he was *dead*; whilest he lived he taught *Heresie*, and when he was dead, he was *condemned* for an Heretick, and with him the Principle which is the hindg of your present faith. Neither did *Vigilius* behave himself one jot better in his Chair. The Councell of *Pisa* deposed *Gregory* the twelfth, and *Benedict* the thir-

teenth,

teenth, for *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks*. The Councell of *Constance* accused *John* the twenty third of *abominable Heresie*, *Sess.* 11. And that of *Basil* condemned *Eugenius*, as one, *à fide devium & pertinacem Hæreticum*, *Sess.* 34. *an erroneous Person and obstinate Heretick*. Other instances of the like nature might be called over, manifesting that your *Popes* have erred, and been condemned as persons erroneous; and therein the Principle of their Infallibility.

I would be unwilling to tire your patience, yet upon your *reiterated* desire I shall present you with one Instance more: and I will do it but briefly, because I must deal with you again about the same matter.

5. Your Church is fallen by *Idolatry*; as otherwise, so in that Religious *Veneration of Images* which she useth, whereunto you have added *Heresie* in teaching it for a Doctrine of Truth, and *imposing* the belief of it by your *Tridentine* Determination, on the Consciences of the Disciples of Christ. I know you would fain mince the matter, and spread over the corrupt Doctrine of your Church about it, with *ῥήσεσιν βυσσίνοις silken words*, as you do the *Posts* that they are made of, with Gold; whenas the Prophet speaks of your predecessors in that work, you *lavish it out of the bagge* for that purpose. But to what purpose? Your *first* Councell, the *second* of *Nice* (which yet was not wholly yours neither, for it condemns *Honorius*, calls *Theresius* the *Oecumenicall Patriarch*, and he expounds in it, the *Rock* on which the Church was built to be (*Christ* and not *Peter*) your last Councell that of *Trent*, your *Angelicall* Doctor *Thomas* of *Aquine*, your great Champions *Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, *Suarez*, *Vasquez*, and the rest of

them, with the Catholick *practise* and usage of your Church in all places, declare sufficiently, what is your *faith* or rather *misbelief* in this matter. Hence *Azorius Institut. Lib. 9. cap. 6.* tells us, that, *Constans est Theologorum sententia, Imaginem eodem honore & cultu coli, quo colitur id cujus est Imago; It is the constant judgement of Divines, that the Image is to be worshipped with the same honour and worship, wherewith that is worshipped whose Image it is.* The *Nicene* Councell, by the instigation of Pope *Adrian*, *Anathematizeth* every one who doth but *doubt* of the *Adoration of Images*, *Act. 7. Thomas* contendeth that the Cross is to be worshipped with *Latria*, *p. 3. q. 25. a. 4.* which is a word that he and you suppose to expresse Religious worship of the *highest* sort. And your Councell of *Trent* in their decree about this matter, confirmed the Doctrine of that *Lestriall conventiculum Nicæ*, whose frauds and impostures were never paralleled in the world, but by it's self. And do you think that a few *ambiguous* flourishing words of you, an *unknown person*, shall make the world believe that they understand not the *Doctrine* and *Practise* of your Church, which is proclaimed unto them, by the *Fathers* and *Masters* of your perswasion herein, and expressed in practises under their eyes, every day? Do you think it so easie for you, *Cornicum oculos configere*, as *Cicero* tells us an Attorney, one *Cn. Flavius*, thought to do, in going beyond all that the great Lawyers had done before him, *Orat. pro Murena.* We cannot yet be perswaded, that you are so great an *Interpreter* of the *Roman Oracles*, as to believe you before all the *Sages* before-mentioned, to whom hundreds may be added. And what do you think of this *Doctrine* and *Practise* of your Church? Hath it been opposed, *judged*, and con-

condemned, or no? The first Writers of Christianity, *Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, Arnobius, Lactantius*, utterly abhorred the use of *all Images*, at least in *Sacris*. The Councell held at *Eliberis* in *Spain*, twelve or thirteen years before the famous Assembly at *Nice*, positively forbid all use of *Pictures* in Churches, *Can.* 36. *Placuit, Picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur & adoratur in parietibus depingatur; The Councell resolved that Pictures ought not to be in Churches, that that which is worshipped and adored, be not painted on walls. Cyprian* condemns it, *Epist. ad Demetriad.* And so generally do all the Fathers, as may be gathered in the pittifull endeavours and forgeries of the *second Nicene Councell*, endeavouring to confirm it from them. *Epiphanius* reckons it among the errors of the *Gnostichs*; and himself *brake* an Image that he found hanging in a Church, *Epist. ad Johan. Hierosol. Austin* was of the same judgement; see *Lib. de morib. Eccles. Cathol. cap.* 34. Your Adoration of them is expresly condemned by *Gregory* the great, in an Epistle to *Serinus*, *Lib.* 7. *Ep* 111 and *Lib.* 9 *Epist.* 9. The Greek Church condemned it, in a Synod at *Constantinople*, *an.* 775. And, one *learned man* in those last dayes undertaking its defence, (and indeed the only man of learning that ever did so, untill of late) they *excommunicated* and cursed him. This was *Damascenus*, concerning whom they used those expressions repeated in the second Nicene Councell, Μανσοὺρ τὸν κακωνύμῳ καὶ σαρρακηνόφρονι ἀνάθεμα. τὸν εἰκονολάτρη καὶ φαλσοφρόφρω μανσοὺρ ἀνάθεμα, τὸν τοῦ χρίστου ὑβριστὴ καὶ ἀποβόλῳ τῆς βασιλείας Μανσοὺρ, ἀνάθεμα. τὸν τῆς ἀποβείας διδασκάλῳ καὶ παρερμηνευτῆ τῆς θείας γραφῆς Μανσοὺρ, ἀνάθεμα. Unto *Mansour of an evil name, and in judgement consenting with Saracens,*

Anathema, *To Manſour, a worſhipper of Images and writer of Falſhood, Anathema*; *To Manſour, contumelious againſt Chriſt and traytor to the Empire, Anathema*, *To Manſour, a teacher of impiety and perverſe interpreter of Scripture, Anathema*. Synod. Nic. 2. Act. 6. For that it was *Johannes Damaſcenus* that they intended, the *Nicene* Fathers ſufficiently manifeſt in the Anſwer following, read by *Epiphanius the Deacon*. And this reward did he meet withall, from the ſeventh Councell at *Conſtantinople*, for his pains in aſſerting the *veneration of Images*; although he did not, in that particular, pervert the Scripture as ſome of you do; but laid the whole weight of his opinion on *Tradition*, wherein he is followed by *Vaſquez* among your ſelves. Moreover, the *Weſtern* Churches, in a great Councell at *Frankeford* in *Germany*, utterly condemned the *Nicene* Determination, which in your *Tridentine* Convention you approve and ratifie, *An.* 794. It was alſo condemned here by the Church of *England*, and the Doctrine of it fully confuted by *Albinus*, *Hoveden Annal. an.* 791. Never was any *Hereſie* more publickly and ſolemnly *condemned*, than this, whereby your Church is fallen from its priſtine purity. But hereof more afterwards.

It were no difficult matter to proceed unto all the *Chief ways*, whereby your Church is *fallen*; and to manifeſt that they have been all publickly diſclaimed and *condemned* by the better and ſounder part of Profeſſors. But the Inſtances inſiſted on, may, I hope, prove ſufficient for your ſatisfaction. I ſhall therefore proceed to conſider what you offer unto the remaining Principles, which I conceived to animate the whole Diſcourſe of your *Fiat Lux*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Other Principles of Fiat Lux *re-examined. Things not at quiet in Religion, before Reformation of the first Reformers. Departure from* Rome *no Cause of Divisions. Returnal unto* Rome, *no means of Union.*

YOu proceed unto the fourth Assertion gathered out of your *Fiat*, which you thus lay down. *It is, say you, frequently pleaded by our Author that all things, as to Religion, were ever quiet and in peace, before the Protestants Relinquishment of the Roman See.* That *ever* is your own addition, but let it pass; what say you hereunto? *This Principle you pretend is drawn out of* Fiat Lux, *not because it is there, but only to open a door to your self to expatiate into some wide generall discourse, about the many wars, distractions, alterations, that have been aforetimes up and down in the World in some severall Ages of Christianity. And you therefore say, it is frequently pleaded by me, because indeed, I never spake one word of it, and it is in truth a false and fond Assertion. Though neither you nor I can deny that such as keep unity of faith with the Church, can never, so long as they hold it, fall out upon that account.* Sr, I take you to be the Author of *Fiat Lux*; and if you are so, I cannot but think you were *asleep* when you talk'd at this rate. The Assertion is *false* and *fond*, *you speak not one word of it.* Pray Sr, take a little advice of your *Son*, *Fiat*, not to talk on this manner, and you will wonder your self, how you came to *swallow* so much confidence as in the face of the world to vent such things

as

as these. He tells us from you, *p.* 234, 235, 236. *Chap* 4. *Ed* 2. that, *After the conversion of this Land by the Children of blessed* St Benet, *notwithstanding the interposition of the Norman Conquest, that all men lived peaceably together without any the least disturbance upon the account of Religion, untill the end of King* Henry *the eighth's raign, about five hundred years after the Conquest.* See also what in generall you discourse of all places to this purpose, *p.* 221, 222. And *p.* 227. you do in expres terms lay down the position which here you so *exclaim* against as *false and fond*; but you may make as bold with it as you please, for it is your own. *Never had this Land,* say you, *for so many hundred years as it was Catholick upon the account of Religion any disturbance at all; whereas after the exile of the Catholick belief in our Land from the period of King* Henry *the seventh's Raign to these dayes, we have been in all pall disquiet or at least in fears. Estne hæc tunica filii tui?* Are not these your words? Doth not your *Son Flat* wear this livery? And do you not speak to this purpose in twenty other places? Is it not one of the main *suppositions* you proceed upon in your whole discourse? You do well now indeed to acknowledg that what you spake was *fond and false*, and you might do as much for the *most* that you have written in that whole discourse; but now openly to *deny* what you have asserted, and that in so many places, that is not so well done of you. There are S^r, many wayes to free your self from that *dammage* you feel or fear from the *Animadversions.* When any thing is *charged* on you, or *proved* against you which you are not able to defend; you may ingenuously acknowledg your *mistake*, and that without any dishonour to you at all: Good men have done so; so may you, or I,

when

when we have just occasion. It is none of your *Tenents*, that you are all of you Infallible, or that your *personall* mistakes or miscarriages will prejudice your Cause. Or you might pass it by, in *silence*, as you have done with the things of the most importance in the *Animadversions*, and so keep up your reputation that you could *Reply* to them if you would, or were *free from flyes*. And we know πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἡ σιωπὴ πρᾶγμα, as *Menander* speaks. Silence is with many the best Answer. Or, you might attempt to *disprove* or *answer*, as the case requires. But this that you have fixed upon, of *denying your own words*, is the very worst course that you could have chosen, upon the account either of Conscience or Reputation. However thus much we have obtained: One of the *chief pretences* of your *Fiat* is by your own confession, *false and fond*. It is indeed no wonder that it *should* be so, it was fully proved to *be* so, in the *Animadversions*; but that you should *acknowledge* it to be so, is somewhat strange; and it would have been very welcome news, had you plainly owned your *conviction* of it, and not renounced your own off-spring. But I see you have a mind to the *benefit* you aymed at by it, though you are ashamed of the way you used for the obtaining of it; and therefore adde; *That neither you, nor I, can deny that such as keep the unity of faith with that Church, can never, so long as they hold it, fall out on that account.* But this, on the first consideration, seems to mee no very *singular* Priviledge; me-thinks a *Turk*, a *Jew*, an *Arian*, may say the same of their Societies: It being no more but this, *So long as you agree with us, you shall be sure to agree with us.* They must be very unfriendly minded towards you, that will call these κοιναὶ δόξαι into question. Yet there remains still one *Scruple* on my

mind

mind, in reference unto what you assert: I am not satisfied that there is in your Church, any such *unity of faith*, as can keep men from falling out, or *differing* in and about the Doctrines and Opinions they profess. If there be, the children of your Church are marvellous *morose*, that they have not all this while learned to be quiet; but are at this very day writing *volumes* against one another, and procuring the Books of one another to be *prohibited* and condemned; which the writings of one of the *learnedest* of you in this Nation, have lately not escaped. I know you will say sometimes, that though you *differ*, yet you differ not in things belonging unto the *unity of faith*. But I fear, this is but a Blind, an *Apron of Fig-leaves*. What you *cannot* agree in, be it of never so great importance, you will agree to say, that it belongs not unto the *unity of faith*; when things no way to be compared in *weight* and *use* with them, so you agree about them, shall be asserted so to do. And in what you *differ*, whilest the scales of Interest on the part of the *combatants* hang even, all your differences are but in *School* and disputable points. But if one party prevail in *Interest* and Reputation, and render their *Antagonists* inconsiderable as to any outward trouble, those very Points that before were *disputable*, shall be made *necessary*, and to belong to the Unity of Faith, as it lately happened in the Case of the *Jansenists*. And here you are safe again, The *Unity of the Faith* is that which you agree in; and that which you *cannot* agree about belongs not unto it, as you tell us, though you talk at another rate among your selves. But *we* must think, that the *Unity of Faith* is bounded by the confines of your wranglements; and your agreement is the Rule of it. This, it may be, you think suits your *turn*: but whether it be so well *suited*

ed unto the Interest of the Gospell and of Truth, you must give men leave to enquire, or they will do it *ingratis*, whether you will or no. But if by the *Unity of Faith* you intend the *substantiall Doctrines of the Gospell*, proposed in the Scripture to be believed on necessity unto Salvation; it is unquestionably among all the Churches in the world, and might possibly be brought forth into some tolerable *communion* in Profession and Practice, did not your *Schismaticall* Interest and Principles interpose themselves to the contrary.

The fifth *Suppositon* in your *Fiat*, observed in the *Animadversions*, is, *That the first Reformers were most of them contemptible Persons, their Means indirect, and their Ends sinister*: To which you reply, *Where is it Sr, where is it, that I meddle with any mens Persons, or say they are contemptible? what and how many are those Persons, and where did they live? But this you adde of your own is in a vast universall notion, to the end you may bring in the Apostles and Prophets, and some Kings into the list of Persons by me surnamed contemptible; and liken my speech who never spake any such thing, to the Sarcasms of* Celsus, Lucian, Porphyry, Julian, *and other Pagans.* So you begin; but *ne savi, magne Sacerdos!* Have a little patience and I will direct you to the *places* where you display in many words that which in a few I represented. They are in your *Fiat*, Chap. 4. §. 18. 2 *edit.* from *pag.* 239, unto §. 20. *p.* 251. Had you lost your *Fiat*, that you make such an *outcry* after that which in a moment he could have supplyed you withall? *Calvin, and a Taylors Widdow, Luther and Catherine Bore, pleased with a naked Unicorn, swarms of Reformers as thick as Grashoppers, fallen Priests and Votaries, ambitious heads, emulating one another, if not the worst,*

yet

yet none of the best that ever were, so eagerly quarrelling among themselves, that a sober man would not have patience to hear their Sermons, or read their Books; with much more to the same purpose you will find in the places, which I have now directed you unto. But I see you love to say *what you please*, but not to hear of it again. But he that can in no more words more truely express the full and *genuine* sense of your eighteenth and nineteenth Chapter than I have done, in the Assertion you so cry out against, shall have my thanks for his pains; Only I must mind you that you have perverted it, in placing the last words, as if they referred unto the Reformers you talk of, that they did their work *for sinister Ends*, when I only said, that *their Doctrine according to their Insinuations was received for sinister Ends*, wherein I comprized your foul reflections upon *King Henry the Eighth* and *Queen Elizabeth* his Daughter, not placing them as you now faign among the number of them, whom I affirmed to be reported by you as a company of *Contemptible Persons*. But now upon a confidence that you have shifted your hands of a necessity to *reinforce* this Assertion, which you find, it may be, in your self an incompetency for, you reflect back upon some former passages in the *Animadversions*, wherein the generall Objections that you lay against *Protestancy*, are observed to be the same for substance that long ago were by *Celsus* objected unto Christianity: And say; *So likewise in the very beginning of this your second Chapter you spend four leaves, in a parallel betwixt mee and the Pagan* Celsus, *whereof there is not any member of it true. Doth* Fiat Lux *say, you lay the cause of all the troubles, disorders, tumults, warres within the Nations of* Europe *upon Protestants? doth he charge the Protestants that by their*

schisms

ſchiſms and ſeditions, they make a way for other revolts? doth he gather a Rhapſody of inſignificant words? doth he inſiſt upon their diviſions? doth he mannage the Arguments of the Jews againſt Chriſt, &c? ſo doth Celſus *who is confuted by* Origen. *Where does* Fiat Lux, *where does, does he, does he, any ſuch thing? Are you not aſhamed to talk at this rate. I give a hint indeed of the Diviſions that be amongſt us, and the frequent argumentations that are made to embroyl and puſle one another; with our much evil and little appearance of any good in order unto unity and peace, which is the end of my diſcourſe. But muſt I therefore be* Celſus? *Did* Celſus *any ſuch thing to ſuch an end? It is the end that moralizeth and ſpecifies the action. To diminiſh Chriſtianity by upbraiding our frailties is paganiſh: to exhort to unity, by repreſenting the inconvenience of faction, is a Chriſtian and pious work. When honeſt Proteſtants in the Pulpit ſpeak ten times more full and vehemently againſt the diviſions, warres, and contentions that be amongſt us, than ever came into my thoughts, muſt they therefore every one of them be a* Celſus, *a Pagan* Celſus? *What ſtuff is this? But it is not only my defamation you aym at; your own glory comes in the reer. If I be* Celſus, *the Pagan* Celſus; *you then, forſooth, muſt be* Origen *that wrote againſt him, honeſt* Origen; *that is the thing. Pray Sr, it is but a word, let me adviſe you by the way, that you do not forget your ſelf in your heat, and give your Wife occaſion to fall out with you. However you may, yet will not your Wife like it perhaps ſo well, that her Husband ſhould be* Origen. Such *traſh* as this, muſt he conſider, who is forced to have to do with you. Theſe, it ſeems, are the *meditations* you are converſant with in your retirements. What little regard you have in them unto *Truth* or honeſty, ſhall quickly be diſcovered

vered unto you. 1. Do I compare you with *Celsus*, or do I make you to be *Celsus*? I had certainly been very much mistaken, if I had done so, ὡς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν, to compare a Person of so small abilities in *literature*, as you discover your self so to be, with so *learned* a *Philosopher*, had been a great Mistake. And I wish you give me not occasion to think you as much Inferiour unto him in *morals*, as I know you are in your *intellectuals*. But Sr, I no where compare *you* unto *him*; but only shew a *co-incidence* of your objections against Protestancy, with some of his against Christianity, which the likeness of your Cause and interest cast you upon. 2. I did not say, *You had the same end with him*: I expressed my thoughts to the *contrary*; nor did compare your act and his, in point of *Morality*; but only shewed, as I said before, a Co-incidence in your Reasonings. This you saw and read, and now in an open *defiance* of Truth and Ingenuity express the contrary. *Celsus* would not have done so. But I must tell you Sr, you are *mistaken*, if you suppose that the *end* doth so absolutely *moralize* an action, that it of its self, should render it *good* or *evil*. Evil it may, but good of its self it cannot. For, *Bonum oritur ex integris causis, malum ex quolibet defectu. Rectifying the intention* will not secure your morality. And yet also, on second thoughts, that I see not much difference between the *ends* that *Celsus* proposed unto himself upon his generall Principle, and those that you propose to your self upon your *own*; as well as the *way* whereby you proceed is the same. But yet upon the accounts before mentioned, I shall free you from your fears of being thought *like* him. 3. When Protestants *preach against our Divisions*, they charge them upon the *Persons* of them that are guilty; whereas you do it on the *Principles* of the Religion

that

that they profess, so that although *you* may deal like *Celsus*, they do not. 4. The scurrilous *Sarcasm* wherewith you close your Discourse, is not meet for any thing but the entertainment of a *Friar* and his *Concubine*, such as in some places formerly men have by *publick Edicts* forced you to maintain, as the only Expedient to preserve their families from being *defiled* by you. 5. Let us now pass through the *Instances* that you have culled out of many, charged upon you, to be the same with those of *Celsus*, concerning which you make such a trebled Outcry; *does he, does he, does he.* The first is, *Doth* Fiat Lux *lay the cause of all Tumults and Disorders on Protestants: clamet licet & mare cœlo confundat. Fiat Lux* doth so, *chap.* 4. §. 17. *p.* 237. §. 18. *p.* 242, 243. §. 20 *p.* 255. and in sundry other places. You adde, *Doth he charge Protestants that by their schisms and seditions they make way for other revolts?* He doth so, and that frequently; *chap.* 3. §. 14. *p.* 187. &c. *Doth he*, you adde, *gather a Rhapsody of insignificant words, as did* Celsus. I say he doth, in the pretended plea that he insists on for *Quakers* and for *Presbyterians* also, *chap.* 3. §. 13. *p.* 172, 173, *&c.* Again, *Doth he manage the Arguments of the Jews against Christianity as was done by Celsus?* He doth directly, *expressly*, and at large, *chap.* 3. §. 12. *p.* 158, *&c.* I confess, because it may be you know it not, you might have questioned the truth of my *parallel* on the side that concerned *Celsus*, which yet I am ready at any time if you shall so do, to give you satisfaction in, but, that you would question it on *your own part*, when your whole discourse and the most of the passages in it, make it so evident, I could not foresee. But your whole *Defence* is nothing but a noise or an outcry, to deter men from coming nigh you to see how the Case stands with you. It will not

serve your turn, ἐσόφθη κύβος, you must *abide* by what you have done, or fairly retract it. In the mean time, I am glad to find you ashamed of that which elswhere you so much boast and glory in.

With the *sixth* and *seventh* Principles mentioned by me, you deal in like manner. You deny them to be yours; which is plainly to deny your self to be the Author of *Fiat Lux*. And surely every man that hath once looked seriously into that *Discourse* of yours, will be amazed to hear you saying that you never asserted, *Our Departure from* Rome *to be the Cause of the Evils among Protestants*; or that, *There is no Remedy for them, but by a Returnal thither again*, which are the things that now you *deny* to be spoken or intended by you. For my part, I am now so used unto this kind of *Confidence*, that nothing you say, or deny, seems strange unto me. And whereas unto your *Denial* you adde not any thing that may give occasion unto any *usefull* Discourse, I shall pass it by, and proceed unto that which will afford us some better advantage unto that purpose.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Further Vindication of the second Chapter of th Animadversions. Scripture sufficient to settle men in the Truth. Instance against it, examined, removed. Principles of Protestants and Romanists in reference unto Moderation, compared and discussed.

THe *eighth Principle*, which way soever it be determined is of great importance, as to the Cause under debate. Here then we shall stay a while, and examine the difficulties which you labour to entangle that *Assertion* withall, which we acknowledge to be the great and *Fundamentall* Principle of our Profession, and you oppose. The Position I laid down as yours is, That the *Scripture on sundry accounts is insufficient to settle us in the Truth of Religion, or to bring us to an agreement amongst our selves.* Hereunto I subjoyned the four heads of *Reasons*, which, in your *Fiat*, you insisted on to make good your Assertion. These you thought meet to pass by, without *reviving* them again to your further disadvantage. You are acquainted, it seems, with the old Rule,

——— *Et quæ*
Desperat tractata nitescere posse, relinquit.

The Position its self you dare not directly *deny*, but yet seek what you can to wave the *owning* of it, contrary to your expres's Discourse, *Chap.* 3. §. 15. *p.* 199, 200, &c. as also in sundry other places, interwoven with expressions exceedingly *derogatory* to the Authority, Excellency, Efficacy, and fullness of the

Scripture, as hath been ſhewed in the *Animadverſions*. But let us now conſider what you plead for your ſelf. Thus then you proceed: *You ſpeak not one word to the purpoſe, or againſt me at all, if I had delivered any ſuch Principle. Gods Word is both the ſufficient and only neceſſary means of both our Converſion and Settlement, as well in Truth as Vertue. But the thing you heed not, and unto which I only ſpeak, is this, that the Scripture be in two hands, for example, of the Proteſtant Church in* England, *and of the Puritan who with the Scripture roſe up and rebelled againſt her, Can the Scripture alone of its ſelf decide the buſineſs. How ſhall it do it? has it ever done it? Or can that written Word now ſolitary, and in private hands, ſo ſettle any in a way that neither himſelf nor preſent adherents, nor future generations ſhall queſtion it, or with as much probability diſſent from it either totally or in part, as himſelf firſt ſet it. This is the Caſe unto which you do neither here, nor in your whole Book, ſpeak one word; And what you ſpeak otherwiſe of the Scriptures excellency I allow it for Good.*

1. Becauſe you are not the *only* Judge of what I have written, nor indeed any *competent* Judge of it at all, I ſhall not concern my ſelf in the *Cenſure* which your Intereſt compells you to paſs upon it. It is left unto the thoughts of thoſe who are more *impartial*. 2. Setting aſide your *Inſtance* pitched on *ad invidiam* only, with ſome *aequivocall* expreſſions, as muſt needs be thought, μαλα ἐπιτηδες, *very artificially* to be put into the ſtate of a Queſtion, and that which you deny is this, that *where any perſons or Churches are at variance or difference about any thing concerning Religion or the Worſhip of God, the Scripture is not ſufficient for the Umpirage of that Difference, ſo that they may be reconciled and enter in the Profeſſion*

of

of the ſame Truth. I wiſh you would now tell me, what *diſcrepancy* there is between the Aſſertion which I aſcribed unto you, and that which *your ſelf* here avow. I ſuppoſe they are in ſubſtance the *ſame*, and as ſuch will be owned by every one that underſtands *any thing* of the matters about which we treat. And this is ſo ſpoken unto in the *Animadverſions*, that you have no mind to undertake the examination of it; but labour to *divert* the diſcourſe, unto that which may appear *ſomething elſe*, but indeed is not ſo. 3. For your Diſtinction between *Proteſtants* and *Puritans* in *England*, I know not well what to make of it. I know no *Puritans* in *England* that are not *Proteſtants*, though all the *Proteſtants* in *England* do not abſolutely agree in every *punctilio* relating to Religion, nor in all things relating unto the *outward worſhip* of God, no more than did the Churches in the Apoſtles dayes, or than your *Catholicks* do. You give us then a Diſtinction like that which a man may give between the *Church of Rome*, and the *Jeſuits* or *Dominicans*; or the Sons of St *Benet*, or of St *Francis* of Aſſize. A Diſtinction or Diſtribution of the *Genus* into the *Genus* and one *Species* comprehended under it; as if you ſhould have ſaid that *Animal* is either *Animal* or *Homo*. 4. Though I had rather therefore that you had placed your *Inſtance* between the Church of *Rome* and *Proteſtants*, yet becauſe any inſtance of Perſons that have *different Apprehenſions* about things belonging to the worſhip of God, will ſuffice us as to the *preſent purpoſe*, I ſhall let it paſs. Only I deſire you once more that when you would endeavour to render any *thing*, *way*, or *acting* of men odious; that you would forbear to caſt the *Scripture* into a Copartnerſhip therein, which here you ſeem to do. *The Puritan*,

ritan, you say, *with the Scripture rose up and rebelled. Rebellion* is the name of an outragious Evil, such as the Scripture giveth not the least Countenance unto. And therefore when you think meet to charge it upon any, you may do well not to say, that *they do it with the Scripture.* It will not be to your *comfort* or advantage so to do. This is but my *advice*, you may do as you see cause.

——— *Tales Casus Cassandra canebat.*

5. The *Differences* you suppose and look upon as *undeterminable* by the Scripture, are about things that in themselves *really* and in truth belong unto Christian Religion, or such as do not *so* indeed, but are only *fancied* by some men so to do. If they are of this *latter sort*, as the most of the Controversies which we have with you are, as about your *Mass*, *Purgatory*, the *Pope*; we account that all Differences about them are sufficiently *determined* in the Scriptures, because they are no where mentioned in them. And this must needs be so, if the Word of God be, as you here grant, *the sufficient and only means both of our Conversion and Settlement as well in Truth as in Vertue.* Sr I had no sooner written these words, in that *haste*, wherein I treat with you, but I suspected a necessity of craving *your pardon*, for supposing *my Inference* confirmed by *your Concession.* For whereas you had immediately before, set down the Assertion supposed to be *yours* about the Scriptures, you adde the words now mentioned, *Gods Word is the sufficient and only means of our Conversion and Settlement in the Truth.* I did not in the least suspect that you intended any *Legerdemain* in the business; but that the *Scripture* and *Gods Word* had been only various *denominations* with you of the same

same precise Thing, as they are with us. Only I confess at the first *view*, I wondred how you could reconcile this *Assertion* with the known Principles of your Church; and besides, I knew it to be *perfectly destructive* of your design in your following Enquiry. But now I fear you play *hide and seek* in the ambiguity your Church hath put upon that Title *Gods Word*, which it hath applyed unto your *unwritten Traditions*, as well as unto the *written Word*; as the *Jews* apply the same term unto their *Orall Law*. And therefore, as I said before, I *crave your pardon*, for supposing my *Inference* confirmed by your Concession, wherein I fear I was mistaken, and only desire you that for the future, you would speak your mind *plainly*, and *candidly*, as it becomes a Christian and Lover of Truth to do. But my Assertion I esteem *never the worse*, though it have not the happiness to enjoy your approbation; especially considering that in the particular *Instances* mentioned, there are many things delivered in Scripture, *inconsistent* with, and *destructive* of your notions about them, sufficient to exterminate them from the *Confines* of the City of God. 6. Suppose the matters in difference do *really* belong unto Religion and the worship of God, and that the Difference lyes only in mens *various Conceptions* of them, you ask, *Can the Scripture alone of its self decide the business?* What do you mean by *alone of its self?* If you mean, without *mens application* of themselves unto it, and *subjecting* of their Consciences unto its Authoritative decisions; neither it, nor any thing else, can do it. The *matter* its self is perfectly stated in the Scripture, whether any men take notice of it or no: but their *various apprehensions* about it, must be regulated by their applications unto it, in the way mentioned. On

this *only* Supposition, that those who are at *variance* about things which *really* appertain unto the Religion of Jesus Christ, will refer the *determination* of them unto the Scripture, and bring the *Conceptions of their minds* to be regulated thereby; standing unto its Arbitriment, it is able *alone* and of *its self* to end all their differences, and settle them all in the Truth. This hath been proved unto you *a thousand times*, and confirmed by most clear *Testimonies* of the Scripture its self, with *Arguments* taken from its Nature, Perfection, and the End of its giving forth unto men; as also from the *practise* of our *Lord Jesus* and his Apostles, with their directions and commands given unto us for the same Purpose; from the *Practise* of the First Churches, with innumerable Testimonies of the *Ancient Fathers* and Doctors. Neither can this be denied without that *horrible Derogation* from its Perfection and *Plenitude*, so reverenced by them of old, which is *objected* unto you, for your so doing. *Protestants* suppose the *Scripture* to be given forth by God, to be unto the Church, a *perfect Rule* of that Faith and Obedience, which he requires at the hands of the sons of men. They suppose that it is *such a Revelation* of his Mind or Will, as is *intelligible* unto all them that are concerned to know it, if they use the *means* by him appointed to come unto a right understanding of it. They suppose that what is not *taught* therein, or not taught so *clearly*, as that men who humbly and heartily seek unto him, may know his mind therein, as to what he requireth of them, cannot possibly be the *necessary and indispensable Duty* of any one to perform. They suppose that it is the Duty of every man *to search the Scriptures* with all diligence, by the help and assistance of the *means* that God hath appointed

in

in his Church to come to the *knowledg* of his mind and will in all things concerning their Faith and Obedience, and firmly to *believe* and adhere unto what they find revealed by him. And they moreover suppose that those who *deny* any of these Suppositions, are *therein*, and so farre as they do so, *injurious* to the Grace, Wisedem, Love, and Care of God towards his Church, to the Honour and perfection of the Scripture, the *Comfort* and establishment of the Souls of men, leaving them *no assured Principles* to build their Faith and Salvation upon. Now from these Suppositions I hope you see that it will unavoidably *follow*, that the Scripture is able every way to effect that, which you deny unto it a *sufficiency* for. For where, I pray you, lyes its defect? I am afraid, from the next part of your *Question*, *Has it ever done it*, that you run upon a great mistake. The defect that follows the *failings* and miscarriages of men, you would have imputed unto the *want of sufficiency* in the Scripture. But wee cannot allow you herein. The Scripture in its place, and in that kind of Cause which it is, is *as sufficient* to settle men, *all men*, in the Truth, as the Sunne is to give *light* to all men to see by: But the Sunne that giveth *light* doth not give *eyes* also. The Scripture doth its work, as a *Morall Rule*, which men are not necessitated or compelled to attend unto or follow. And if through their *neglect* of it, or not attendance unto it, or *disability* to discern the mind and will of God in it, whether proceeding from their *naturall impotency* and blindness in their lapst condition, or some *evil habit* of mind contracted by their giving *admission* unto corrupt prejudices and Traditionall Principles, the work be not effected; this is no impeachment of the Scriptures *sufficiency*, but a manifestation of their weak-

weakneſs and folly. Beſides, all that *unity in faith* that hath been at any time or is in the world according to the mind of God, every *Deciſion* that hath been made at any time of any *difference* in or about Religion in a right way and order, hath been by the Scripture, which God hath *ſanctified* unto thoſe ends and purpoſes. And it is impoſſible that the *miſcarriages* or defects of men can reflect the leaſt *blame* upon it, or make it eſteemed *inſufficient* for the end now enquired after. The purſuit then of your Enquiry which now you inſiſt upon, is in part *vain*, in part already *anſwered*. In *vain* it is that you enquire *whether the written Word can ſettle any man in a way that neither himſelf, nor preſent adherents, nor future Generations ſhall queſtion*: For our enquiry is not after what *may* be, or what *ſhall* be, but what *ought* to be. It is *able* to ſettle a man in a way, that none *ought* to queſtion unto the worlds end: So it *ſetled* the firſt Chriſtians. But to ſecure us that none *ſhall* ever queſtion the way whereinto it leads us; that it is not *deſigned* for, nor is it either needfull or poſſible that it ſhould be ſo: The *Orall preaching* of the Sonne of God, and of his Apoſtles, did not ſo ſecure them whom they taught. The way that they *profeſſed*, was *every where queſtioned*, contradicted, ſpoken againſt, and many, after the profeſſion of it, again renounced it: And I wonder what *feat* you have to ſettle any one in a way that ſhall never be queſtioned. The *Authority* of your *Pope* and *Church* will not do it: Themſelves are things as *highly queſtioned* and diſputed about, as any thing that was ever *named* with reference unto Religion. If you ſhall ſay, But yet they *ought* not to be ſo queſtioned, and it is the *fault* of men that are ſo: You may well ſpare me the labour of anſwering your Queſtion, ſeeing

seeing you have done it your self. And whereas you adde, *or with as much probability dissent from it either totally or in part, as himself first set it*, when the very preceding words do not speak of a mans *own setting*, but of the *Scriptures setling*, the man only embracing what that setleth and determineth: It is answered already; that what is so *setled* by the Scripture, and received as *setled*, cannot *justly* be questioned by any. And you insinuate a most irrationall *Supposition* on which your Assertion is built, namely that *Errour* may have as much probability as *Truth*. For I suppose you will grant, that what is *setled* by the Scripture is *true*, and therefore that which dissents from it must needs be an *errour*; which that it may be as *probable* indeed as Truth (for we speak not of appearances, which have all their strength from our weaknesses) is *a new notion* which may well be added to your *many other* of the like rarity and evidence. But, why is not the Scripture *able to settle* men in unquestionable Truth? When the people of old *doubted* about the wayes of God wherein they ought to walk, himself sends them *to the Law and to the Testimony* for their instruction and settlement, *Isa* 8.20. And we think the counsell of him, who *cannot deceive* nor be deceived, is to be hearkned unto, as well as his command to be obeyed. Our Saviour assures us, that if men *will not hear Moses and the Prophets*, and take direction from them for those wayes wherein they may please God, they will not do it, whatsoever they pretend from any *other means*, which they rather approve of, *Luk.* 16.29,31. Yea and when the great *Fundamental* of Christian Religion, concerning the *Person* of the *Messiah*, was in question, he sends men for their settlement *unto the Scriptures*, Joh. 5.39. And we suppose that that

which

which is *sufficient* to settle us in the *foundation*, is so, to confirm us also in the whole *superstructure*. Especially considering that it is able *to make the man of God perfect, and to be thoroughly furnished unto all good works*, 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. What more is required unto the *settlement* of any one in Religion wee know not; nor what can *rationally* stand in competition with the Scripture to this purpose; seeing that is *expressly* commended unto us for it by the Holy Ghost, other wayes are built on the *conjectures* of men. Yea the Assurance which we may have hereby is preferred by *Peter*, before that which any may have by an *immediate voyce from Heaven*, 2 Pet. 1. 19. And is it not an *unreasonable* thing, now for you to come and tell us, that the Scripture is not *sufficient* to give us an unquestionable *settlement* in Religion? Whether it be meet to *hearken unto God or men*, judge you. For our parts, wee seek not for the *foundation* of our *settlement*, in long uncertain *discourses*, dubious *conclusions* and inferences, fallible *conjectures*, sophisticall *reasonings*, such as you would call us unto; but in the expresse direction and command of God. Him we can follow, and trust unto without the least fear of miscarriage; Whither you would *lead* us wee know not, and are not willing to make *desperate experiments* in things of so high concernment. But since you have been pleased to overlook what hath been discoursed unto this purpose in the *Animadversions*, and with your usuall confidence to affirm, *that I no where at all speak one word to the Case that you proposed*, I shall for your further *satisfaction* give you a little enlargement of my thoughts, as to the Principles on which *Protestants* and *Romanists* proceed in these matters, and compare them together, that it may be seen whether of

of us build on the *most stable and adequate* foundation as to the superstruction aymed at, by us both.

Two things you profess, if I mistake not, to ayme at in your *Fiat*, at least you pretend so to do; 1. *Moderation* in and about our differences whilest they continue: 2. The *reduction* of all dissenters unto an *unity in Faith* and Profession: Things no doubt *great* and excellent: He can be no Christian that *aymes* not at them, that doth not earnestly desire them. You profess to make them *your* Design: Protestants do so also. Now let us consider whether of the *two*, *you* or *they*, are fitted with Principles according unto the *diversity* of Professions wherein you are engaged, for the *regular* accomplishment and effecting of these ends: And in the consideration of the latter of them, you will find your present Case fully and clearly resolved.

For the first, of *Moderation*, I intend by it, and I think so do you also, the mutuall *forbearance* of one another, as to any *effects of hatred*, enmity, or animosities of any kind, attended with *offices* of Love, Charity, Kindness, and Compassion, proceeding from a *frame of heart* or gracious *habit* of mind naturally producing such effects, with a *quiet*, peaceable deportment towards one another, during our present *differences* in, or about any thing in Religion. Certainly, this *Moderation* is a blessed thing; earnestly *commended* unto us by our Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles, and as necessary to preserve *peace* among Christians, as the *Sunne* in the firmament is to give light unto the world. The very Heathen could say μέτρον μέτρων ἄριστον, *Moderation* is the life of all things, and nothing is durable but from the *Influence* which it receives from it. Now in pressing after *moderation* Protestants proceed chiefly on *two* Principles, which

which being *once* admitted make it a *Duty* indiſpenſable: And I can aſſure you that no man will long follow after *moderation*, but only he that looks upon it as *his Duty* ſo to do: Incident provocations will quickly *divert* them in their courſe, who purſue it for any other *ends*, or on any other accounts.

The firſt Principle of the *Proteſtants* diſpoſing them to *moderation* and indiſpenſably exacting it of them as their *Duty*, is, that amongſt all the *Profeſſours* of the Name of Chriſt who are known by their Relation unto *any Church* or *Way* of Note or Mark in the world, not actually condemned in the *Primitive* or *Apoſtolicall* times, there is ſo much *ſaving Truth* owned and taught, as being received with faith, and ſubmitted unto with ſincere obedience, is *ſufficient* to give them that profeſs it an *Intereſt* in Chriſt, and in the Covenant of Grace, and Love of God, and to ſecure their ſalvation. This Principle hath been *openly* defended by them, and I profeſs it to be *mine*. It is true, there are wayes whereby the *Truth* mentioned may be rendred *ineffectuall*; but that hinders not, but that the *Principle* is true, and that the Truth ſo received is *ſufficient* for the producing of thoſe effects in its kind and place. And let men pretend what they pleaſe, the *laſt* day will diſcover, that that Faith which *purifieth the heart*, and renders the perſon in whom it is, *accepted* to God by Jeſus Chriſt, may have its *objective Truths* confined in a very narrow compaſs; yet it muſt embrace all that is indiſpenſably *neceſſary* to ſalvation. And it is an unſufferable *Tyranny* over the Souls and Conſciences of men, to introduce and aſſert a *neceſſity* of believing, whatever this or that Church, any or indeed all Churches ſhall pleaſe to propoſe. For, the *propoſall* of all the Churches in the world cannot make

make any thing to be *necessary* to be believed, that was not so *antecedently* unto that proposall. Churches may *help* the faith of Believers, they cannot *bow them* it, or exercise any dominion over it. He that believeth that *whatever God reveales* is true, and that the holy Scripture is a *perfect Revelation* of his mind and will, (wherein almost all Christians agree,) need not fear that he shall be burdened with *multitudes* of particular Articles of Faith? provided he do his *Duty* in sincerity, to come to an *acquaintance* with what God hath so revealed. Now if mens *common Interest* in Christ their head, and thereby their *participation* of the same Spirit from him, with their *union* in the bond of the Covenant of Grace, and an *equall sharing* in the Love of God the Father, be the *Principles*, and, upon the matter, the only grounds and reasons of that *speciall Love* without dissimulation which Christians ought to bear one towards another, from whence the *moderation* pleaded for must proceed, or it is a thing of no use, in our present case, at least no way generally *belonging* to the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and if all these things may be obtained by vertue of *that Truth* which is professed in common among all *known Societies of Christians*, doth it not unavoidably follow, that we ought to exercise *moderation* towards one another, however *differing* in or about things which destroy not the *Principles* of Love and Union? Certainly we *ought*, unless we will resolvedly *stifle* the actings of that Love, which is implanted in all the Disciples of Christ, and besides *live* in an open disobedience unto his commands. This then indispensably exacts *moderation* in *Protestants* towards them that differ from them, and that not only within the lines of *Protestancy*, because they believe, that, notwithstanding that *dissent*, they

have,

have, or *may* have for ought they know, an *interest* in those things; which are the only reasons of that *Love* which is required in them towards the Disciples of Christ. There is a *moderation* proceeding from the Principles of *Reason* in generall, and requisite unto our common *interest* in humanity; which is good, and an especiall *ornament* unto them in whom it is; especially if they are Persons *exalted* above others in place of Rule and Goveanment. Men *fierce*, implacable, revengefull, impatient, treading down all that they *dislike* under their feet, are the greatest defacers of the *Image* of God in the world, and upon the matter the only troublers of humane Society. But the *moderation* which the *Gospel* requireth, ariseth and proceedeth from the Principles of *Union* with Christ before mentioned; which is that, that proves us Disciples of Christ indeed, and will confirm the mind in suitable actings, against all the *provocations* to the Contrary, which from the infirmities and miscarriages of men we are sure to meet withall. Neither doth this at all hinder but that we *may contend earnestly for the Truth delivered unto* us, and labour, by the wayes of Christ's appointment, to *reclaim* others from such *opinions*, wayes, and practises, in and about the things of Religion and worship of God, as are *injurious* unto his Glory, and may be *destructive* and pernicious to their own souls. Neither doth it in the least put any *discouragement* upon endeavours, to oppose the *impiety* and Prophaneness of men in their corruption in *life* and Conversation, which certainly and unquestionably are *inconsistent* with, and destructive of the Profession of the Gospel, let them on whom they are found, be of what party, Church, or way of Religion they please. And if those in whose *hearts are the wayes of God*, however

ever *diverſifyed* among themſelves by various apprehenſions of ſome *Doctrines* and *Practiſes*, would ſincerely according to their *Duty* ſet themſelves to oppoſe that *prophaneneſs*, wickedneſs of Life, or open *vitioſneſs* of Converſation, which is breaking in like a *flood* upon the world, and which as it hath already almoſt *drowned* the whole glory of Chriſtian Religion, ſo it will undoubtedly, if not prevented end in the wofull calamity and *finall ruine* of Chriſtendome, they would have *leſs mind* and leaſure to wrangle fiercely among themſelves, and breathe out deſtruction againſt one another, for their *miſtakes*, and differences about things, which by their own *experience* they find not to take off from *their Love* to Chriſt, nor *weaken* the obedience he requires at their hands. But whileſt the whole power of Chriſtianity is *deſpiſed*, Converſion to God, and ſeparation from the wayes of the periſhing World, are *ſet at nought*, and men think, they have *nothing* to do in Religion, but to be zealouſly addicted to this or that *party* amongſt them that profeſs it, it is no wonder if they think their *chiefeſt Duty* to conſiſt in deſtroying one another. But for men that profeſs to be *leaders* and guides of others in *Chriſtian Religion*, openly to perſue *carnall* and worldly intereſts, *greatneſs*, wealth, outward Splendour, and Pomp, to live in *Luxury* and pride, to labour to *ſtrengthen* and ſupport themſelves by the adherence of *Perſons* of prophane and wicked lives, that ſo they may deſtroy all that in any opinion *differ* from themſelves, is, vigorouſly to endeavour to *drive* out of the world that Religion which they profeſs; and in the mean time to render it ſo *uncomely* and undeſirable, that others muſt needs be *diſcouraged* from its embracement. But theſe things cannot ſpring from the Principles of *Proteſtants*, which as I

have manifested *lead* them unto other manner of actings. And it is to no purpose to ask, why then they are not all *affected* accordingly. For they that are not so, do live in an *open contradiction* to their own avowed Principles; which that it is no news in the world, the *vicious lives* of many in all places professing Christianity, will not suffer us to doubt. For though that Religion which they profess, teacheth them to *deny all ungodliness and wordly lusts, to live soberly, and righteously, and godlily in this present world*, if they intend the least benefit by it, yet they will *hold the profession* of it in a contrary practise. And for this *self-deceiving* attended with *eternall ruine*, many men are beholding unto such *notions* as yours about your *Church*, securing Salvation within the *pale* of its externall Communion, laying little weight on the things which at the *last day* will only stand them in stead. But for *Protestants*, letting aside their *occasionall exasperations*, when they begin to bethink themselves, they cannot satisfie their own Consciences in a *resolution*, not to love them, because of some differences, whom they believe that *God loves*, or *may love*, notwithstanding those Differrences from them: or to renounce *all Union* with them, who they are perswaded are united unto Christ; or not to be *moderate* towards them in this world, with whom they expect to live for *ever* in another. I speak only of them on all sides, who have received into their *hearts*, and do express in their *lives* the Spirituall Power and *energy* of the Gospel, who are *begotten unto Christ by the Word of Truth*, and have received of his *Spirit* promised in the Covenant of Grace unto all them that believe on him. For, not to dissemble with you, I believe all others as to their *present state* to be in the same condition

dition before God; be they of what Church or way they will, though they are not all in the same condition in respect of the *means* for their Spirituall advantage which they enjoy or may do so, they being much more *excellent* in some Societies of Christians than others. This then, to return, is the *Principle* of Protestants, *derived* down unto them from Christ and his Apostles, and hereby are they eminently furnished for the exercise of that *moderation*, which you so much, and so *deservedly* commend. And, more fully to tell you my *private judgement*, which whether it be my *own* only I do not much concern my self to enquire, but this it is; Any man in the world who *receiveth* the Scripture of the Old and New Testament, as the Word of God, and on that account *assents* in generall to the whole Truth revealed in them, *Worshipping God* in Christ, and yeelding *obedience* unto him answerable unto his *light* and Conviction, not contradicting his profession by any *practise* inconsistent with true piety, nor the owning of any *opinion* or perswasion destructive to the known *fundamentals* of Christianity; though he should have the *unhappiness* to dissent in some things from all the Churches that are at this day in the world, may yet have an *internall supernaturall* saving Principle of his faith and obedience, and be undoubtedly saved. And I am sure, it is my Duty to exercise *Moderation* towards every man, concerning whom I have, or ought to have, that Perswasion.

2. Some *Protestants* are of *that judgement* that *externall force* ought to have *no place* at all in matters of faith; however *Laws* may be constituted with *Penalties* for the preservation of publick outward order in a Nation; most of them, that *Hæreticidium* or putting men to death for their *misapprehensions* in the

things of God is absolutely unlawfull; and *all of them*, that Faith is the Gift of God, for the communication whereof unto men, he hath appointed *certain means*, whereof *externall force* is none. Unto which Two last *Positions*, not only the greatest *Protestant*, but the greatest *Potentate* in *Europe*, hath *lately* in his own words, expressive of an *heavenly benignity* towards mankind in their infirmities, declared his *Royall* Assent. And I shall somewhat question the *Protestancy* of them, whom his *Authority*, Example, and Reason, doth not conclude, in these things. For my part I desire no *better*, I can give no *greater* warrant to assert them as the Principles of *Protestants*, than what I have now acquainted you with. And it is no small *satisfaction* unto me to contemplate on the *heavenly Principle* of Gospel peace, planted in the noble soyl of *Royall Ingennity and Goodness*, whence fruit may be expected to the great profit and *advantage* of the whole world. Now it is easie to discover the *naturall* and genuine tendency of these Principles towards *Moderation*. Indeed in acting according unto them, and in a *regular consistency* with them consists the *Moderation* which we treat about. Wherever then *Protestants* use not that *Moderation* towards those that *dissent* from them if otherwise *peaceable*, which the *Lord Jesus* requires his Disciples to exercise towards all them that *profess* the same common hope with them, the fault is solely in the *Persons* so offending; and is not countenanced from any *Principles* which they avow. Whether it be so with those of your *Church*, shall now be considered.

1. You have no one *Principle* that you more *pertinaciously* adhere unto, nor which yeelds you greater advantage with weak *unstable souls*, than that whereby you *confine all Christianity within the bounds*

of

of your own Communion, The Roman Church and the *Catholick* are with you, one and the ſame. No *Priviledge* of the Goſpell you ſuppoſe, belongs unto any *ſoul* in the world, who lives not in your *Communion*, and in profeſſed ſubjection unto the *Pope*. *Union* with Chriſt, ſaving *Faith* here, with *ſalvation* hereafter, belongs to no other, no not one. This is the moderation of your Church, whereunto your outward *actings* have for the moſt part been ſuited. Indeed, by this one Principle, you are utterly *incapacitated* to exerciſe any of that *moderation* towards thoſe that diſſent from you which the Goſpell requires. You cannot *love* them as the Diſciples of Chriſt, nor *act* towards them from any ſuch Principles. It is poſſible for you to ſhew *moderation* towards them as *men*; but to ſhew any *moderateon* towards them, as thoſe partakers of the ſame *precious faith* with you, that is impoſſible for you to do. Yet this is *that* which we are enquiring after: not the *moderation* that *may* be amongſt men as men, but that which *ought* to be amongſt Chriſtians as Chriſtians: This is Goſpell moderation, the other is common unto us with *Turks*, *Jews*, and *Pagans*, and not at all of our preſent diſquiſition. And I wiſh that *this* were found amongſt you as proceeding from the Principles of *Reaſon*, with ingenuity and goodneſs of nature, more than it is. For that which proceedeth from, and is regulated by *Intereſt*, is *Hypocriticall*, and not thank-worthy: As *occaſion* offers it ſelf, it will turn and change, as we have found it to do in moſt Kingdoms of *Europe*. Apparent then it is, that this fundamentall Principle of your Profeſſion, *Subeſſe Romano Pontifici*, &c. that it is of *indiſpenſible neceſſity unto Salvation unto every Soul to be ſubject unto the Pope of Rome*, doth utterly incapacitate you for

that *moderation* towards any that are not of you, which Christ requires in his *Disciples* towards one another; seeing you judg none to be *so*, but your selves. Yet I assure you withall, that I *hope*, yea I am verily *perswaded*, that there are *many*, very many, amongst you, whose minds and affections are so influenced by common *ingrafted* notions of God and his Goodness, with a *sense* of the frailties of mankind, and weakness of the *evidence* that is tendred unto them, for the eviction of that indispensible necessity of subjection to the *Pope*, which their Masters urge, as also with the *beams* of Truth shining forth in generall in the Scriptures, and what they *know* or have heard of the *practises* of *primitive* times, as that, being *seasoned* with Christian charity and candour, they are not so *leavened* with the sowr prejudice of this Principle, as to be rendred unmeet for the due exercise of *moderation*; but for this, they are not beholding to your Church, nor this great Principle of your profession.

2. It is *the Principle* of your Church, whereunto your Practise hath been suited, that those who *dissent from you* in things determined by your Church, being *Hereticks*, if they *continue so to do*, after the application of the *means* for their reclaiming which you *think meet to use*, *ought to be imprisoned*, *burned*, *or one way or other put to death*. This you cannot deny to be your Principle, it being the very foundation of your *Inquisition*, the chief *corner-stone* in your present Ecclesiasticall fabrick, that couples and holds up the whole building together: And it hath been asserted in your *practice* for sundry Ages in most Nations of *Europe*: Your Councels, as that of *Constance*, have determined it, and practised accordingly, with *John Huss*, and *Hierome*: Your Doctors *dispute* for it,

it, your Church *lives* upon it. That you are destitute of any *colour* from Antiquity in this your way, I have shewed before: *Bellarmine de Laic. cap.* 22. could find no other Instances of it, but that of *Priscillianus*, which what entertainment it found in the Church of God, I have declared; with that of one *Basilius* out of *Gregories Dialogues*, *Lib.* 1. *Cap* 4. whom he confesseth to have been a *Magitian*; and of *Bogomilus* in the dayes of *Alexius Comnenus* 1100 years after Christ, whose putting to death notwithstanding, was afterward censured and *condemned* in a *Synod* of more sober Persons than those who procured it. Instance of your avowing this Principle in your dealing with the *Albigenses* of old, the Inhabitants of *Merindol* and *Chrabiers* in *France*, with the *Waldenses* in the valleys of *Piedmont*, formerly and of late; of your *judiciary* proceedings against multitudes of Persons of all sorts, conditions, ages, and sexes in this and most other Nations of *Europe*, you are not pleased with the mention of, I shall therefore pass them by. Only I desire you would not question whether this be the *Principle* of your Church or no, seeing you have given the world too great assurance that so it is: And your self in your *Fiat* commend the wisdome of *Philip* King of *Spain* in his rigour in the pursuit of it, p. 243. These things being so, I desire to know, what *foundation* you have to stand upon in pressing for *moderation* amongst dissenters in *Religion*: I confess, it is a huge argument of your *good nature*, that you are so inclinable unto it: but when you should come to the reall *exercise* of it, I am afraid you would find your hands tied up by these Principles of your Church, and your *endeavours* thereupon become very faint and evanid. Men in such cases may make great pretences,

At velut in somnis oculos ubi languida pressit
Nocte quies, nequicquam avidos extendere cursus
Velle videmur, & in mediis conatibus ægri
Succidimus.

being destitute of any *reall foundation*, your attempts are but like the fruitless endeavours of *men in their sleep*, wherein great workings of spirits and *Fancy*, produce no effects. I confess notwithstanding all this, *others* may be *moderate* towards you: I judg it their *duty* so to be, I desire they may be so; but how you should exercise *moderation* towards others, I cannot so well discern. Only as unto the *former*, so much more am I relieved as unto *this* Principle, from the perswasion I have of the candour and ingenuity of many *individuall Persons* of your Profession; which will not suffer them to be captivated under the Power of such *corrupt prejudices* as these. And for my part if I could approve of *externall force* in any Case in matters of Religion, it would be against the promoters of the *Principle* mentioned.

——— *Cogendus* ———
In mores hominemq;. Creon.

When men under pretence of *Zeal* for Religion, depose all sense of the *Laws* of Nature and humanity, some *earnestness* may be justified in unteaching them their unnoward *Catechisms*, which lye indeed not only against the design, Spirit, Principles, and letter of the Gospell: but *Terrarum leges & mundi fœdera*; the very foundations of Reason on which men *coalesce* into civill society. But as we observed before out of one of the Antients, *Force hath no place in or about the Law of Christ*, one way or other.

That which gave occasion unto this Discourse, was your

your inſinuation of the Scriptures *Inſufficiency* for the ſettlement of men in the Unity of Faith, the contrary whereof being the great *Principle* of *Proteſtancy*, I was willing a little to enlarge my ſelf unto the conſideration of *your* Principles and *ours*: not only with reference unto the *Unity of Faith*, but alſo as unto that *moderation* which you pretend to *plead* for, and the want whereof you charge on *Proteſtants*, premiſing it unto the enſuing diſcourſe, wherein you will meet with a full and a direct Anſwer unto your Queſtion.

CHAP. VII.

Unity of Faith wherein it conſiſts. Principles of Proteſtants as to the ſetling men in Religion and Unity of Faith, propoſed and confirmed.

THe next thing *propoſed* as a Good to be aymed at, is *Unity in Faith* and *ſettlement*, or infallible aſſurance therein. This is a *Good* deſireable for its ſelf; whereas the *moderation* treated of, is only a *medium* of relief againſt other evils, untill this may be attained. And therefore though it be, upon ſuppoſition of our *Differences*, earneſtly to be *endeavoured* after, yet it is not to be *reſted* in, as though the utmoſt of our Duty conſiſted in it, and we had no proſpect beyond it. It is a *Catholick Unity* in Faith, which all Chriſtians are to aym at, and ſo both you and wee profeſs to doe; only wee differ both about the *Nature* of it, and the proper *means* of attaining it. For the Nature of it, you conceive it to conſiſt in the *explicit* or *implicit* belief of *all things and Doctrines determined on, taught, and propoſed by*

your

your Church be believed, and nothing else, (with faith supernaturall) but what is so taught and proposed. But this description of the *Unity of Faith*, wee can by no means admit of. 1. Because it is *Novel*; it hath no footstep in any *Writings* of the Apostles, nor of the first *Fathers* or Writers of the Church, nor in the practice of the Disciples of Christ for many Ages. That the Determination of the *Roman* Church, and its *proposall* of things or *Articles* to be believed should be the adequate Rule of Faith unto all Believers, is a matter as forreign unto all Antiquity, as that the Prophesies of *Montanus* should be so. 2. Because it makes the *Unity of Faith* after the full and last Revelation of the Will of God, *flux*, *alterable*, and *unstable*, lyable to increase and decrease; whereas it is *uniform*, constant, alwayes the same in all Ages, times, and places, since the finishing of the *Canon* of the Scriptures. For we know, and all the world knows, that your Church hath determined many things lately, some χθὲς καὶ πρώην, as it were but *yesterday*, to be believed, which *its self* had never before determined, and so hath *increased* the Rule of Faith, moved its *Center*, and extended its *Circumference*: and what she may further determine and propose to *morrow*, no man knows; and your duty it is to be ready to believe whatever she shall so *propose*; whereby you cannot certainly know unto your dying day whether you do believe all that may belong to the *Unity of Faith*, or no. Nay 3. your Church hath determined and *proposed* to be believed expres *Contradictions*, which Determinations abiding on record, you are not agreed *which* of them to adhere unto, as is manifest in your *Conciliary Decrees* about the Power of the *Pope* and the *Councill*, unto which of them the preheminence is due. Now this is a

strange

strange Rule of the Unity of Faith, that is not only capable of *encrease*, *changes*, and *alterations*, so that, that may belong unto it one day, which did not belong unto it another, as is evident from your *Tridentine* Decrees, wherein you made many things *necessary* to be believed which before were esteemed but probable, and were the subjects of *Sophistical* altercations in your *Schools*; but also comprizeth in its self expres's *Contradictions*, which cannot at all belong unto *faith* because both of them may be *false*, one of them must be so; nor to *Unity*, because Contrary and adverse. 4. Whereas *holding the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace*, or the Unity of faith is so great and important a *Duty* unto all Christians, that they can no way discharge their Consciences unto God, without a well grounded satisfaction that they live in the *performance* of it, this description of its Nature, renders it *morally impossible* for any man explicitly to know, (and that only a man knows which he knows explicitly) that he doth answer his *Duty* herein. For 1. the Determinations of your Church of things to be believed are so *many* and *various*, that it is not within the Compass of an ordinary Diligence and ability to search and find them out. Nor when a man hath done his *utmost*, can he obtain any tolerable security, that there have not *other Determinations* been made, that he is not as yet come to an acquaintance with all, or that he *ever* shall so do; and how in this Case he can have any satisfactory perswasion that he keeps the *Unity of Faith*, is not as yet made evident. 2. In the *Determinations* he may meet withall, or by any means come to the knowledge of, he is to receive and believe the things determined and *proposed* unto him, in *the sense intended by the Church*, or else he is never the nearer to his end.

end. But what that *ſenſe* is in the moſt of your Churches *propoſals*, your *Doctors* do ſo endleſly quarrell among themſelves, that it is impoſſible a man ſhould come unto any great *Certainty* in his enquiry after it; yet a preciſe meaning in all her *propoſals* your Church muſt have, or ſhe hath none at all. What ſhall a man do when he comes unto one of your *great Maſters* to be acquainted with the genuine *ſenſe* of one of your Churches Propoſals, this being the way that he takes for his ſatisfaction. Firſt he ſpeaks unto the *Article* or Queſtion to be conſidered in *Generall*; then gives the *different ſenſes* of it according to theſe and thoſe *famous Maſters*, the moſt of which he *confutes*; who yet all of them profeſſed themſelves to explain, and to ſpeak according to the *ſenſe* of your Church; and laſtly gives his own *interpretation* of it, which it may be within a few moneths, is confuted by another. 3. Suppoſe a man have attained a *knowledge* of all that your Church hath determined and *propoſed* to be believed, and to a right underſtanding of her *preciſe ſenſe* and meaning in all her determinations and *propoſals*, which I believe never yet man attained unto, yet what aſſurance can he have if he live in any place remote from *Rome*, but that your Church may have made ſome *new Determinations* in matters of faith, whoſe embracement in the *ſenſe* which ſhe intends belongs unto his keeping the Unity of Faith, which yet he is not acquainted withall. Is it not ſimply impoſſible for him to be ſatisfied at any time that he believes *all* that is to be believed, or that he holds the *Unity of Faith*? Your late *Pontificall Determination* in the Caſe of the *Janſeniſts* and *Moliniſts*, is ſufficient to illuſtrate this inſtance. For I ſuppoſe you are equally bound, *not to believe* what your Church

Church condemneth as *Hereticall*, as you are bound *to believe* what it propoſeth for *Catholick* Doctrine.

4. I deſire to know when a man who lives here in *England*, *begins* to be obliged to believe the Determinations of your Church that are made at *Rome*. It may be he firſt hears of them in a *Mercury* or weekly News book; or it may be he hath notice of them by ſome *private Letters* from ſome who live near the place; or it may be he hath a knowledge of them by *common report*; or it may be they are printed in *ſome Books*, or that there is a *brief* of them publiſhed ſomewhere under the name of the *Pope*; or they are put into ſome *Volume* written about the *Councels*; or ſome *Religious Perſons* on whom he much relyes, aſſures him of them. I know you believe that your Churches *Propoſition* is a ſufficient means of the *Revelation* of any Article, to make it neceſſary to be believed; but I deſire to know what is *neceſſary* to Cauſe a man to receive any Dictate or Doctrine *as* your Churches *propoſition*; not only upon this account, that you are not very well agreed upon the *Requiſita*, unto the making of ſuch a *Propoſition*, but alſo becauſe, be you as *infallible* as you pleaſe in your *Propoſals*, the means and wayes you uſe to *communicate* thoſe Propoſals you make, unto Individuals in whom alone the faith whereof we treat exiſts, are all of them *fallible*. Now that which I deſire to know is, *What is*, or what are thoſe certain *means* and wayes of communicating the *Propoſitions* of your Church unto any *Perſon*, wherein he is bound to acquieſce, and upon the application of them unto him to believe them, *fide divina cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*. Is it any *one thing*, or way, or means, that the hinge upon which his aſſent turns? Or is it a *Complication* of many things concurring to the ſame purpoſe?

pose? If it be any *one* thing, way, or *medium*, that you fix upon, pray let us know it, and we shall *examine* its fitness, and sufficiency for the use you put it unto. I am sure we shall find it to be either *infallible* or *fallible*. If you say the *former*, and that that particular upon which the Assent of a mans mind unto any thing to be the proposall of your Church depends, must in the *testimony* it gives, and evidence that it affords be esteemed *infallible*, then you have as many infallible Persons, things, or writings, as you make use of to acquaint one another with the determinations of your Church; that is, upon the matter *you are all so*; though I know in particular that *you* are not. If the *latter*; notwithstanding the first pretended *infallible Proposition*, your faith will be found to be resolved immediately into a *fallible* information. For, what will it advantage me, that the *proposall* of your Church cannot *deceive* me, if I may be *deceived* in the Communicating of that Proposall unto me? And I can with no more *firmness*, certainty, or assurance, believe the thing proposed unto me, than I do believe that it is the *Proposall* of the Church wherein it is made. For you pretend not unto any *self-evidencing* efficacy in your Churches Propositions, or things proposed by it; but all their Authority, *as to me*, turns upon the Assurance that I have of their relation unto your Church, or that they are the *Proposals* of your Church; concerning which I have nothing but very *fallible* evidence, and so cannot possibly believe them with Faith Divine and Supernatural. If you shall say that there are *many things* concurring unto this Communication of your Churches Proposals unto a man, as the *notoriety of the Fact*, *suitable proceedings* upon it, *books written* to prove it, *Testimonies of good men*, and the like,

like; I cannot but mind you, that all theſe being *ſigillatim*, every one apart *fallible*, they cannot in their Conſpiracy improve themſelves into an Infallibility. Strengthen a *Probability* they may, teſtifie *infallibly* they neither do nor can. So that on this account it is *not* only impoſſible for a man to know whether he holds the *Unity of Faith* or no; but indeed whether he believe *any thing at all* with Faith Supernaturall and Divine; ſeeing he hath no infallible evidence for what is propoſed unto him to believe, to build his faith upon.

5. *Proteſtants* are not ſatisfied with your generall *implicit aſſent* unto what your Church teacheth and determineth, which you have invented to ſolve the difficulties that attend your Deſcription of the *Unity of Faith*. Of what uſe it may be unto *other purpoſes*, I do not now diſpute, but as to this, of the preſervation of the *Unity of Faith*, it is certainly of none at all: The Unity of Faith conſiſts in *all mens* expreſs believing all, that *all men* are bound expreſly to believe, be it what it will: Now you would have this preſerved by mens *not believing* what they are bound to believe: For what belongs to this keeping the *Unity of Faith* they are bound to believe expreſly, and what they believe *implicitly*, they do indeed no more but not expreſly disbelieve; for if they do any more than not *disbelieve*, they put forth ſome act of their underſtanding about it, and ſo farre *expreſly* believe it: So that upon the matter, you would have men to keep the *Unity of Faith*, by *a not believing* of that, which that they may keep the Unity of Faith they are bound expreſly to believe: Nor can you do otherwiſe whileſt you make all the *Propoſitions* of your Church of things to be believed, to belong to the Unity of Faith. Laſtly, The *Determinations* of

your

your Church you make to be the next *efficient Cause* of your Unity; now these not being absolutely *infallible*, leave it, like *Delos*, flitting up and down in the *Sea of Probabilities* only: This we shall manifest unto you immediately; at least we shall evidence that you have no *cogent reasons*, nor stable grounds to prove your Church *infallible* in her Determinations. At present, it shall suffice to mind you, that she hath Determined *Contradictions*, and that in as eminent a manner as it is possible for her to declare her sense by; namely by *Councils* confirmed by *Popes*; and an *infallible determination of Contradictions*, is not a Notion of any easie digestion in the thoughts of a man in his right wits. We confess then, that we cannot *agree* with you in your *Rule* of the Unity of Faith, though the thing its self we press after as our *Duty*. For, (2.) Protestants do not conceive this *Unity* to consist in a precise Determination of *all Questions* that are or may be raised in or about things belonging unto the Faith, whether it be made by *your Church* or any other way. Your *Thomas* of *Aquine*, who without question is the best and most *sober* of all your *School Doctors*, hath in one Book given us 522 *Articles* of Religion, which you esteem miraculously stated; *Quot Articuli, tot Miracula*. All these have at least *five Questions* one with another stated and determined in explication of them; which amount unto 2610 *Conclusions* in matters of Religion. Now we are farre from thinking that *all these Determinations*, or the like, belong unto the Unity of Faith, though much of the Religion amongst some of you, lyes in not dissenting from them. The Questions that your *Bellarmine* hath determined and asserted the Positions in them *act of faith*, and necessary to be believed, are I think neer 40 *times* as many as the

the Articles of the *antient Creed* of the Church; and such as it is most evident that, if they be of the nature and importance pretended, it is impossible that any *considerable* number of men should ever be able to discharge their duty in this business of holding the *Unity of Faith*. That a man believe in generall that the *holy Scripture* is given by inspiration from God, and that all things *proposed* therein for him to believe, are therefore *infallibly* true, and to be as such believed, and that, in particular, he believe *every Article* or point of Truth, that he hath *sufficient means* for his instruction in, and conviction that it is so revealed, they judg to be *necessary* unto the holding of the Unity of Faith. And this also they know, that this *sufficiency of means* unto every one that enjoys the benefit of the Scriptures, extends its self unto *all those Articles* of Truth, which are necessary for him to believe, so as that he may yield unto God the *obedience* that he requireth, receive the *holy Spirit of promise*, and be accepted with God. Herein doth that *Unity of Faith* which is amongst the Disciples of Christ in the world consist; and ever did, nor can do so in any thing else. Nor doth that *variety* of Apprehensions that in many things is found among the Disciples of Christ, and *ever* was, render this *Unity*, like that you plead for, various and Incertain. For the Rule and formall Reason of it, namely *Gods Revelation in the Scripture*, is still *one* and the same, perfectly unalterable. And the severall *degrees* that men attain unto in their Apprehensions of it, doth no more reflect a charge of variety upon it, than the difference of *Seeing* as to the severall degrees of the sharpness or obtuseness of our bodily eyes, doth upon the Light given by the Sunne. The Truth is; if there was any *common measure* of the Assents of men,

either as to the *intenſion* of it, as it is ſubjectively in their minds; or *extenſion* of it, as it reſpecteth Truths revealed that belonged unto the *Unity* of Faith, it were impoſſible there ſhould be any ſuch thing in the world, at leaſt that any ſuch thing ſhould be *known* to be. Only this I acknowledg, that it is the *Duty* of all men to come up to the full and *explicit acknowledgment* of all the Truths revealed in the word of God, wherein the *Glory* of God, and the Chriſtians *Duty* are concerned: as alſo to a joynt *conſent in* Faith *objective*, or propoſitions of Truth revealed; at leaſt in things of moſt importance, though their faith *ſubjective*, or the internal aſſent of their minds have, as it will have, in ſeverall Perſons, *various degrees*, yea in the *ſame* Perſons it may be, at different ſeaſons. And in our labouring to come up unto this *joynt-acknowledgment* of the ſame *ſenſe* and intendment of God in all revealed Truths, conſiſts our endeavour after that *perfection* in the Unity of Faith which in this life is attainable; as our *moderation* doth in our walking in peace and love with and towards others, according to what we have *already* attained. We may diſtinguiſh then between that *Unity of Faith* which an intereſt in, gives *Union* with Chriſt unto them that hold it, and *Communion* in Love with all equally intereſted therein; and that *Accompliſhment* of it, which gives *a ſameneſs* of Profeſſion, and conſent in all acts of *outward Communion* in the worſhip of God. The *firſt* is found in, and amongſt, all the Diſciples of Chriſt in the world where-ever they are; the *latter* is that which moreover it is your *Duty* to preſs after. The *former* conſiſts in an *Aſſent in generall* unto all the Truths of God revealed in the Scripture, and in *particular* unto them that we have *ſufficient means* to evidence them unto us to be ſo revealed;

revealed: The *latter* may come under a double consideration; for either there may be required unto it in them who hold it, the *joynt perception* of, and assent unto every Truth revealed in the Scripture, with an *equall degree* of certainty in adherence and evidence in perception, and it is not in this life, wherein the best of us *know but in part*, attainable; or only such a concurrence in an assent unto the *necessary Propositions* of Truth, as may enable them to hold together that outward Communion in the worship of God which we before mentioned. And this is certainly *attainable*, by the wayes and means that shall immediately be layed down: And where this is, there is the *Unity of Faith*, in that compleatness which we are bound to *labour* for the attainment of. This the *Apostolicall* Churches enjoyed of old; and unto the recovery whereof, there is nothing more prejudiciall than your *new* stating of it upon the account of your Churches Proposals.

This *Unity of Faith* we judg good, and necessary, and that it is our Duty to press after it: So also in generall do you. It remains then, that we consider what is the *way*, what are the means and Principles, that *Protestants* propose and insist upon for the attainment of it; that is, in *answer to your Question, What it is that can settle any man in the Truth of Religion, and unite all men therein.* And then because you object this unto us, as if we were at some loss and *uncertainty* therein, and your selves very *secure*, I shall consider what are the grounds and principles that *you* proceed upon for the same ends and purposes, namely to *settle any man in the Truth of Religion, and to bring all men to an harmony and consent therein.*

Now I shall herein manifest unto you these two things; 1. That the Principles which the *Protestants*

proceed upon, in the improvement whereof they obtain themſelves aſſured and infallible *ſettlement* in the Truth, and labour to reduce others unto the *Unity of Faith*, are ſuch as are both *ſuited* unto, and *ſufficient* for, the end and work which they deſign to effect by them, and alſo in themſelves of ſuch *unqueſtionable Truth*, Certainty, and Evidence, that either they are all *granted* by your ſelves, or cannot be *denied* without ſhaking the very Foundations of Chriſtianity. 2. That thoſe which you proceed upon, are ſome of them *untrue*, and moſt of them *dubious* and *queſtionable*, none of them *able* to bear the weight that you lay upon them; and ſome of them ſuch as the admiſſion of, would give *juſt cauſe* to queſtion the whole Truth of Chriſtian Religion. And both theſe Sr, I crave leave to manifeſt unto you, whereby you may the better judg whether the *Scripture* or your Church be the beſt way to bring men unto *ſettlement* in Religion, which is the thing enquired after.

1. Proteſtants lay down this as the ἀρχὴ τῆς σωτηρίου & ὁμολογίας, as the very *beginning* and firſt Principle of their confidence and Confeſſion, that *all Scripture is given by inſpiration of God*, as the Holy Ghoſt teacheth them, 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. That is, that the *Books of the Old and New Teſtament* were all of them written by the immediate guidance, direction, and inſpiration of God; *the hand of the Lord*, as *David* ſpeaks, 1 *Chron.* 28. 19. *being upon* the Penmen thereof *in writing*; and his Spirit, as *Peter* informs us, *ſpeaking* in them, 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. So that whatever is contained and delivered in them, is *given* out from God, and is received on his Authority. This Principle I ſuppoſe you grant to be *true*; do you not? if you will deny it ſay ſo, and we will proceed no farther, untill we have proved it. I know you have various wayes

wayes laboured to *undermine* the *αὐτοπιστία* of the Holy Scriptures; many Queries you put unto men, How they *can know it* to be from God, to be *true*, from *Heaven*, and not of men; many *scruples* you indeavour to possess them with, against its Authority; it is not my present business to remove them: It is *sufficient* unto mee, 1. That you your selves who *differ* from us in other things, and with whom our contest about the *best way* of coming to settlement in the Truth alone, is, do acknowledg this Principle wee proceed upon to be *true*. And 2. That yee cannot oppose it without setting your selves to *digge* up the very *foundations* of Christian Religion, and to open a way to let in an inundation of *Atheism* on the world. So our first step is fixed on the grand *fundamentall* Principle of all the Religion and acceptable worship of God that is in the world.

2. They affirm *that this Scripture evidenceth it self by many infallible τεκμήρια, to be so given by Inspiration from God; and besides is witnessed so to be, by the Testimony of the Church of God from the dayes of* Moses, *wherein it began to be written, to the dayes wherein we live*; our Lord Christ and his Apostles asserting and confirming the same *Testimony*; which Testimony is conveyed unto us by uninterrupted *Catholick Tradition*. The first part of this Position, I confess, *some* of you deny; and the latter part of it you generally all of you *pervert*, confining the Testimony mentioned unto *that* of your present Church, which is a very inconsiderable *part* of it, if any part at all. But how groundlesly, how prejudicially, to the *verity* and honour of Christian Religion in generall you do these things, I shall briefly shew you.

Some of you, I say, deny the first part of this Assertion; so doth *Andradius Defens. Concil. Trident.*

Lib. 3. *Neq; enim*, saith he, *in ipsis Libris quibus Sacra Mysteria conscripta sunt, quicquam inest Divinitatis, quod nos ad Credendum qua illis continentur, religione aliqua constringat?* *Neither is there in the Books themselves, wherein the holy Mysteries are written, any thing of Divinity, that should constrain us by vertue of any religious respect thereunto, to believe the things that are contained in them.* Hence *Coclæus*, Lib. 2. *de Authoritate Eccles. & Script.* gathers up *a many instances* out of the Book of the Scripture, which he declares to be altogether *incredible*, were it not for the Authority of the Church. I need not mention any more of your Leaders, concurring with them; you know who is of the *same mind* with them, if the Author of *Fiat Lux* be not unknown to you. Your resolving *Universal Tradition* into the Authority of your present Church, to which end there is a Book written not long since by a *Jesuit* under the name of *Vincentius Severinus*, is no less notorious. Some of you, I confess, are more modest, and otherwise minded, as to both parts of our Assertion. See *Malderus Episcop. Antwerp. de Object. Fidei*, qu. 1. *Vaselius Groningen. de Potestat. Eccles. & Epist. ad Jacob. Hoek. Alliacens. in Lib.* 1. *Sentent. Artic.* 3. *Gerson Exam. doct. part.* 2. *Consid.* 1. *Tom.* 1. *fol.* 105. and in twenty other places. But when you come to deal with *Protestants*, and consider well the *Tendency* of this Assertion, you use I confess an hundred *tergiversations*, and are most unwilling to come to the acknowledgment of it; and rather then *suffer* from it, deny it downwright; and that with *Scurrilous reflections*, and Comparisons, likening it, as to any characters of Gods truth and Holiness upon it, unto *Livy's* Story, yea *Æsops* Fables, or a *Piece of Poetry*. And when you have done so, you apply your selves

to

to the *canvaſing* of *Stories* in the *Old Teſtament*, and to find out appearing *Contradictions*, and tell us of the uncertainty of the *Authors* of ſome particular *Books*; that the whole is of its ſelf *a dead letter* which can prove nothing at all; enquiring, Who told us that the *Penmen* of it were *divinely inſpired*, ſeeing they *teſtify* no ſuch things of themſelves? and if they ſhould, yet others may do, and have done ſo, who notwithſtanding were not ſo *inſpired*, and ask us, Why we receive the Goſpel of *Luke* who was not an Apoſtle, and reject that of *Thomas* who was one; with many the like *Cavilling* Exceptions.

But (1.) That muſt needs be a *bad Cauſe* which ſtands in need of ſuch a Defence. Is this the voice of *Jacob*, or *Eſau*? Are theſe the expreſſions of *Chriſtians*, or *Pagans*? from whoſe *quiver* are theſe arrows taken? Is this fair, ſober, Candid Chriſtian dealing? have you no way to defend the *Authority of your Church*, but by Queſtioning the *Authority of the Scripture*? Did ever any of the *Fathers* of old, or any in the world before your ſelves, take this courſe to plead their *intereſts* in any thing they profeſſed? Is this Practice *Catholick*, or like many of your Principles; ſingular, your own, *Donatiſticall*? Is it any great ſign that you have an intereſt in that *living Child*, when you are ſo ready he ſhould be deſtroyed, rather than you would be caſt in your *Conteſt* with Proteſtants? (2.) Do you think that this courſe of proclaiming to *Atheiſts*, *Turks*, and *Pagans*, that the *Scripture*, which all Chriſtians maintain againſt them to be the *Word of the Living GOD*, given by inſpiration from Him, and on which the Faith of all the *Martyrs* who have ſuffered from their oppoſition, rage, and cruelty, and of all others that *truly believe* in Jeſus Chriſt, was and is founded, and

whereinto it is resolved, hath no Arguments of its *Divine Original* implanted on it, no *lines* of the Excellencies and Perfections of its *Author* drawn on it, no *power* or efficacy towards the Consciences of men, evidencing its Authority over them, no *Ability* of its self to comfort and support them in their tryals and sufferings with the hope *of things that are not seen?* Is this, think you, an *acceptable service* unto the Lord Christ, who will one day judg the secrets of all hearts according unto that Word? or, Is it not really to *expose* Christian Religion to scorn and contempt? And do you find so much sweetness in, *Dolus an Virtus? quis in hoste requirat*, as to cast off *all Reverence of God* and his Word, in the pursuit of the supposed Adversaries of your earthly Interests? (3.) If your Arguments and Objections are *effectuall* and *prevalent* unto the end for which you intend them, will not your direct issue be the utter overthrow of the very *foundation* of the whole Profession of Christians *in the world?* And are you, like *Sampson*, content to *pull down the house* that must fall upon your selves also, so that you may *stifle* Protestants with its fall? It may be, it were well you should do so; were it an house of *Dagon*, a Temple dedicated unto Idols: but, to deal so with that *wherein dwels the Majesty of the Living GOD*, is not so justifiable. It is true; *Evert* this Principle, and you overthrow the *foundation* on which the faith of Protestants is built; but it is no less true, that you do the same to the *foundation* of the Christian Faith in generall, wherein *we* hope your own concernment also lyes. And this is the thing that I am declaring unto you; namely, that either you acknowledg the Principles on which *Protestants* build their Faith and Profession, or by denying them you open a door unto *Atheism*, at least to the extirpation

extirpation of *Chriſtian Religion* out of the world. I confeſs you pretend a relief againſt the preſent *inſtance*, in the Authority of your Church, ſufficient as you ſay to give a *Credibility* unto the Scriptures, though its own *ſelf-evidencing* Power and Efficacy, with the Confirmation of it by *Catholick Tradition* excluſive to your *preſent ſuffrage*, be rejected. Now I ſuppoſe you will grant, that the *Prop* you ſupply men withall upon your caſting down the foundations on which they have laid the *weight of their eternall Salvation*, had need be firm and immoveable. And remember that you have to do with them, who though they may be otherwiſe inclineable unto you,

Non tamen ignorant quid diſtent æra lupinis,

and muſt uſe their *own judgements* in the Conſideration of what you tender unto them. And they Ask you, 1. What will you do if it be as you ſay with them who *abſolutely* reject the Authority of your Church, which is the condition of more than a *moyety* of the Inhabitants of the world, to ſpeak ſufficiently within compaſs? And 2. What will you adviſe us to ſay to *innumerable* other Perſons that are pious and *rational*, who, upon the meer conſideration of the *lives* of many, of the moſt, of the guides of your Church, your *bloody inhumane practices*, your purſuit of worldly *carnall* deſigns, your *viſible ſecular* intereſt wherein you are combined and united, cannot perſwade themſelves, that the *Teſtimony* of your Church in and about things that are *inviſible*, ſpirituall, heavenly, and eternall, is at all *valuable*, much leſs that it is ſufficient to bear the weight you would lay upon it. 3. Was not this the way and method of *Vaninus* for the Introduction of his *Atheiſm*; firſt to *queſtion*, ſleight, and *ſophiſtically* except againſt

againſt the old approved *Arguments*, and Evidences manifeſting the being and exiſtence of a *Divine ſelf-ſubſiſting Power*, ſubſtituting in their room, for the confirmation of it, his own *Sophiſms*, which himſelf knew might be eaſily diſcuſſed and diſproved? Do you deal any better with us in decrying the Scripture's *ſelf-evidencing Efficacy*, with the *Teſtimony* given unto it by God himſelf, ſubſtituting nothing in the room thereof but the Authority of your Church? A man certainly can take up nothing upon the *ſole* Authority of your Church, untill, contrary to the *pretenſions*, Reaſons, and Arguments of far a greater number of Chriſtians than your ſelves, he acknowledge you to be *a true Church* at leaſt; if not the *only* Church in the world. Now, how I pray will you bring him into that ſtate and *condition* that he may *rationally* make any ſuch judgement? How will you prove unto him that there is any ſuch thing as a *Church* in the World; that a Church hath *any* Authority, that its *Teſtimony* can make any thing *credible*, or meet to be believed. You muſt prove theſe things to him, or whatever *aſſent* he gives unto what you ſay, is from *fanaticall credulity*. To ſuppoſe that he ſhould *believe* you upon *your word, becauſe you are the Church*, is to ſuppoſe that he believes *that*, which you are yet but attempting to *induce* him to believe. If you perſiſt to preſs him without other *proof*, not only to believe what you *firſt* ſaid unto him, but alſo even this, that whatever you *ſhall ſay* to him hereafter that he muſt *believe* it, becauſe you *ſay* it; Will not any rationall man *nauſeate* at your unreaſonable importunity? and tell you that men who have a mind to be *befooled*, may meet with ſuch *Alchymiſticall* pretenders all the world over. Will you perſwade him that *you are the Church*

Church, and that the Church is furniſhed with the Authority mentioned, by *rational Arguments*? I wiſh you would inform me of any *one* that you can make uſe of, that doth not include a *Suppoſition* of ſomething *unproved* by you, and which can never be *proved* but by your own Authority, which is the thing in Queſtion, or the *immediate Authority* of God which you reject. A number indeed of *pretences*, or, it may be, *Probabilities* you may heap together, which yet upon examination will not be found ſo much neither, unleſs a man will ſwallow amongſt them that which is deſtitute of all *Probability*; but what is included in the evidence given unto it by Divine Revelation which is not yet pleaded unto him. It may be then you will work *Miracles* to confirm your Aſſertions. Let us ſee them. For although very many things are *requiſite* to manifeſt any *works of wonder* that may be wrought in the world to be *reall Miracles*, and good Caution be required to judge unto what *end* Miracles are wrought; yet if we may have any tolerable evidence of your *working Miracles* in Confirmation of this Aſſertion, that you are the *true and only Church of God*, with the other Inferences depending thereon, which we are in the Conſideration of, you will find us very *eaſie to be treated* withall. But herein alſo you fail. You have then no way to *deal* with ſuch a man as we firſt ſuppoſed, but as you *do* with us; and produce *Teſtimonies of Scripture* to prove and confirm the Authority of your Church; and then you will quickly find *where* you are, and what ſnares you have caſt your ſelves into. Will not a man who hears you proving the *Authority of your Church* by the Scripture, ask you, And whence hath this *Scripture its Authority*? yea that is ſuppoſed to be the thing in *Queſtion*, which

which denying unto it an *αὐτοπιστία*, you yet produce to confirm the Authority of that, by whose Authority alone, its self is *evidenced* to have any Authority at all. *Rest* in the Authority of God *manifesting* its self in the Scripture, witnessed unto by the *Catholick Tradition* of all Ages, you will not. But you will prove the *Scripture* to be the Word of God by the *Testimony* of your Church; and you will prove your *Church* to be enabled *sufficiently* to testifie the Scriptures to be of God, by the *Testimonies* of the Scripture. Would you knew where to begin and where to end? But you are indeed in a *Circle* which hath neither beginning nor ending; I know not when we shall be enabled to say,

Inventus, Chrysippe, tui finitor acervi.

Now do you think it *reasonable* that we should leave our stable and immoveable firm *foundations*, to run round with you in this *endless Circle*, untill through giddiness we fall into Unbelief or Atheism? This is that which I told you before, you must either *acknowledge* our Principle in this matter to be *firm* and certain, or open a door to *Atheism*, and the Contempt of Christian Religion; seeing you are not able to *substitute* any thing in the room thereof, that is able to bear the *weight* that must be laid upon it, if we believe. For how should you do so; *shall man be like unto God*, or equall unto him? The Testimony we rest in is *Divine*, fortified from all Objections by the strongest *humane Testimony* possible, namely *Catholick Tradition*. That which you would supply us with, is meerly *Humane* and no more. And 4. your Importunity in *opposing* this Principle, is so much the more marvellous unto us, because therein you openly oppose your selves to *express* Testimonies

of

of Scripture and the full *Suffrage* of the Ancient Church. I wish you would a little weigh what is affirmed, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20. *Psal.* 119. 152. *Joh.* 5. 34, 35 36, 39. 1 *Thess.* 2. 13. *Act.* 17. 11. 1 *Joh.* 5. 6, 10. 1 *Joh.* 2. 20. *Heb.* 11. 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Act.* 26. 22. And will you take with you the *consent* of the Ancients? *Clemens Alexand. Strom.* 7. speaks fully to our purpose, as he doth also *lib.* 4. where he plainly affirms that the Church proved the *Scripture by its self, and other things*, as the Unity of the Deity, *by the Scripture.* But his own words in the former place are worth the recital, Ἔχομεν, saith he, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς πίστεως, τὸν Κύριον, διὰ τὸ τῶν προφητῶν, διάτε τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ διὰ τῶν μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων πολυτρόπως καὶ πολυμερῶς ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος ἡγούμενον τῆς γνώσεως. τὴν ἀρχὴν δ' εἴτις ἑτέρου δεῖσθαι ὑπολάβοι, οὐκέτ' ἂν ἔν τως ἀρχὴ φυλαχθείη. *For the beginning of Faith, or Principle of what we teach, we have the Lord; who in sundry manners, and by divers parts, by the Prophets, Gospel, and holy Apostles, leads us to knowledge. And if any one suppose, that a Principle stands in need of another* (to prove it) *he destroys the nature of a Principle*; or, *it is no longer preserved a Principle.* This is that we say: The Scripture, the *Old and New Testament*, is the Principle of our Faith. This is *proved by its self*, to be of the Lord who is its Author; and if we cause it to depend on any thing else, it is no longer the *Principle* of our Faith and Profession. And a little after, where he hath shewed that a *Principle* ought not to be disputed, nor to be the τὸ κοινόμενον of any debate, he addes, Εἰκότως γοῦν πίστει περιλαβόντες ἀναπόδοικτον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ περιουσίας καὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις παρ' αὐτῆς, τῆς ἀρχῆς λαβόντες, φωνῇ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα πρὸς τὴν ἐπιγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας: *It is meet then, that receiving by Faith the most absolute Principle without other demonstration, and taking*

taking demonstrations of the Principle from the Principle its self, that we be instructed by the voice of the Lord unto the knowledge of the Truth. That is; we *believe the Scripture* for its own sake, and the Testimony that God gives unto it, in it and by it; and do prove every thing else by it, and so are confirmed in the *faith* or knowledge of the Truth. So he further explains himself, οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς ἀποφαινομένοις ἀνθρώποις προσέχομεν, οἷς καὶ ἀνταποφαίνεσθαι ἐπ' ἴσης ἔξεστιν. *For we do not simply or absolutely attend or give heed unto men determining or defining, against whom it is equall that we may define or declare our judgements.* So it is; whilest the *Authority* of man, or men, any *Society* of men in the world, is pleaded, the Authority of others, may by as *good reason* be objected against it; as whilest, you plead your Church and its *definitions*, others may on as good grounds oppose theirs unto you therein. And therefore *Clemens* proceeds; Ἐι δ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μόνον ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν τὸ δόξαν, ἀλλὰ πιστεύεσθαι δεῖ τὸ λεχθὲν, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον, ἢ πασῶν ἀποδείξων ἐχεγγυωτέρα, μᾶλλον δ' ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις οὖσα τυγχάνει. καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν, πιστοί. *For if it be not sufficient meerly to declare or assert that which appears to be truth, but also to make that Credible or fit to be believed which is spoken, we seek not after the Testimony that is given by men, but we confirm that which is proposed, or enquired about with the voice of the Lord, which is more full than any demonstration, or rather is its self the only demonstration; according to the knowledge whereof they that have tasted of the Scriptures, are believers.* Into the *voice*, the *Word* of God alone, the Church then *resolved* their Faith, this *only* they built upon, acknowledging all *humane Testimony* to be too weak,

weak, and infirm to be made a foundation for it; And this *voice of God* in the Scripture evidencing its self so to be, is the only *Demonstration* of Faith which they rested in; whereupon a little after he addes, ὥστε οὖν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν τελείας ἀποδείξεις ἔχοντες ἐν πίστει πειθόμεθα ἀποδεικτέως; *so we having perfect Demonstrations out of the Scriptures, are by Faith demonstratively assured or perswaded of the Truth of the things proposed.* This was the Profession of the Church of old; this the *resolution* of their faith; This is that which *Protestants* in this Case adhere unto. They *proved* the Scripture to be from God, as he elswhere speaks, ἐξ ἀποδείξεως πιστοποιήσεως, as we also do. *Strom.* 4. To this purpose speaks *Salvianus* de Gub. Lib. 3. *Alia omnia (id est humana dicta) argumentis & testibus egent; Dei autem Sermo ipse sibi testis est, quia necesse est ut quicquid incorrupta veritas loquitur, incorruptum sit testimonium veritatis: All other sayings stand in need of Arguments and Witnesses to confirm them, the Word of God is witness to its self; For, whatever the Truth incorrupted speaks, must of necessity be an incorrupt Testimony of Truth.* And although some of them allowed the *Testimony of the Church* as a motive unto believing the Gospell or things preached from it, yet as to *the belief of the Scripture* with faith Divine and Supernaturall to be the Word of God, they required but these two things; 1. That *Self-Evidence* in the Scripture its self which is needfull for an *indemonstrable Principle*; from which, and by which, all other things are to be demonstrated: And that Self-Evidence *Clemens* puts in the place of all Demonstrations. 2. The *Efficacy of the Spirit* in the heart, to enable it to give a *saving assent* unto the Truth proposed unto it: Thus *Austin* in his Confessions

Lib.

Lib. 6. cap. 5. *Perſuaſiſti mihi, ô Domine Deus, non eos qui crederent libris tuis quos tanta in omnibus fere Gentibus authoritate fundaſti eſſe culpandos; ſed eos qui non crederent, nec audiendos eſſe, ſiqui mihi forte dicerent. Unde ſcis, illos libros unius veraciſſimi Dei Spiritu eſſe, humano generi miniſtratos; id ipſum enim maximè credendum erat. O Lord God, thou haſt perſwaded me, that not they who believe thy Books which with ſo great Authority thou haſt ſetled almoſt in all Nations, were to be blamed; but thoſe who believe them not, and that I ſhould not hearken unto any of them who might chance to ſay unto me, Whence doſt thou know thoſe Books to be given out unto mankind from the Spirit of the only True GOD; for that is the thing which principally was to be believed.* In which words, the holy man hath given us full direction what to ſay when you come upon us with that Queſtion which ſome uſed it ſeems in his dayes. A great Teſtimony of the Antiquity of your Principles. Adde hereunto what he writes in the 11th Book and 3d Chapter of the ſame Treatiſe, and wee have the ſumme of the Reſolution and Principle of his Faith: *Audiam*, ſaith he, *& intelligam, quomodo feciſti Cœlum & terram: Scripſit hoc Moſes, ſcripſit & abiit, tranſivit hinc ad Te. Neq; enim nunc ante me eſt: nam ſi eſſet, tenerem eum, & rogarem eum, & per Te obſecrarem ut mihi iſta panderet, & præberem aures corporis mei, ſonis erumpentibus ex ore ejus. At ſi Hebræa voce lequeretur, fruſtra pulſaret ſenſum meum, nec inde mentem meam tangeret: ſi autem Latinè, ſcirem quid dictret; ſed, Unde ſcirem an verum diceret? quod ſi & hoc ſcirem, num & ab illo ſcirem? Intus ubiq; mihi, intus in domicilio cogitationis, nec Hebræa, nec Græca, nec Latina, nec barbara veritas ſine oris & linguæ organis, ſine ſtrepitu ſyllabarum diceret, verum*

dicit;

dicit; & ego statim certus confidenter illi homini tuo dicerem, Verum dicis. Cum ergo illum interrogare non possim, Te, quo plenus vera dixit, Veritas, rogo Te Deus meus, rogo, parce peccatis meis, & qui illi servo tuo dedisti hæc dicere, da & mihi hæc intelligere. I would hear and understand, O Lord, how thou hast made the Heavens and the earth: Moses *wrote this, he wrote it and is gone, and he is gone to Thee. For now he is not present with mee; if he were, I would lay hold on him, and ask him and beseech him for thy sake, that he would unfold these things unto me, and I would cause the ears of my body to attend unto the words of his mouth. But if he should speak in the Hebrew tongue, he would only in vain strike upon my outward sense, and my mind within would not be affected with it. If he speak in Latine, I should know what he sayed; but whence should I know that he spake the Truth? should I know this also from him? The Truth, that is neither Hebrew, Greek, Latine, nor expressed in any Barbarous Language, would say unto me inwardly in the dwelling place of my thoughts, without the organs of mouth or tongue, or noyse of syllables, He speaks the Truth; and I with confidence should say unto him thy servant, Thou speakest the Truth. Seeing therefore I cannot enquire of him, I beseech Thee that art Truth, with whom he being filled spake the Truth, I beseech thee O my God, pardon my sinnes, and thou who gavest unto him thy servant to speak these things, grant unto me to understand them.* Thus this holy man ascribes his *assent* unto the unquestionable Principle of the Scripture, as to the *effecting* of it in himself, to the *work of God's Spirit* in his heart. As *Basil* also doth on *Psalm* [illegible] *Faith which*

 draws

draws the soul unto consent above the efficacy of all rational wayes or methods of perswasion; Faith, that is wrought and begotten in us not by geometricall enforcements or demonstrations, but by the effectuall operations of the Spirit. And both these Principles are excellently expressed by one amongst your selves, even *Baptista Mantuanus*. Lib. de Patientia, Cap. 32, 33. *Sæpenumerò*, saith he, *mecum cogitavi, Unde tam suadibilis esset ista Scriptura, ut tam potenter influat in animos auditorum; unde tantum habeat energia, ut non adopinandum sed ad solidè credendum omnes inflectat. I have often thought with my self Whence the Scripture is so perswasive, whence it doth so powerfully influence the minds of the hearers; whence it hath so much efficacy, that it should incline and bow all men, not to think as probable, but solidly to believe, the things it proposeth. Non*, saith he, *est hoc imputandum rationum evidentiæ quas non adducit, non artis industriæ & verbis suavibus & ad persuadendum accommodatis quibus non utitur. It is not to be ascribed unto the evidence of Reasons, which it bringeth not, neither to the excellency of Art, sweet Words, and accommodated unto perswasion, which it makes no use of. Sed vide an id in causa sit quod persuasi summam eam à prima veritate fluxisse; But see if this be not the Cause of it, that Wee are perswaded that it proceeds from the prime Verity.* He proceeds, *Sed unde summa ista persuasio nisi ab ipsa, quasi ad ei credendum non sua ipsius trahat Authoritas. Sed unde quaso hanc sibi Authoritatem vindicavit? Neque enim vidimus nos Deum concionantem, scribentem, docentem; tamen ac si vidissemus, credimus & tenemus à Spiritu Sancto fluxisse quod legimus: Forsitan fuerit hac ratio firmiter adhærendi, quòd in ea veritas sit solidior quamvis non clarior. Habet enim omnis veritas vim inclinativam, & major*

majorem

majorem, maxima maximam. Sed cur ergo omnes non credunt Evangelio? Respondeo quod non omnes trahuntur à Deo. And again, *Inest ergo Scripturis Sacris nescio quid Naturâ sublimius, id est inspiratio facta divinitus & divinæ irradiationis influxus certus. But whence are wee perswaded, that it is from the First Verity, but from it Self; Its own Authority draws us to believe it. But whence obtains it this Authority? We see not God preaching, writing, teaching; but yet, as if We had seen him, We believe and firmly hold that which We read to have come from the Holy Ghost. It may be that this is a reason of our firm adhering unto it, that the Truth in it is more solid, though not more clear* (than in any other way of proposall) *and all truth hath a power to incline unto belief; the greater the Truth the greater its power, and the greatest Truth must have the greatest power so to incline us. But, why then do not all believe the Gospell? I answer, because all are not drawn of God. There is then in the holy Scripture somewhat more sublime than Nature, that is, the Divine Inspiration from whence it is, and the Divine Irradiation wherewith it is accompanied.* This is the Principle of Protestants. The Sacred Scripture is *credible* as proceeding from the first Verity: this it manifests by its *own Light and Efficacy*; and we are enabled to believe it by the *effectuall* working of the Spirit of God in our hearts. Whence our Saviour asks the *Jews*, Joh 5. *If you believe not the writing of Moses, how will you believe my words.* They who will not believe the *written Word* of the Scripture, upon the Authority that it hath in its self, would not *believe* if Christ should *personally* speak unto them. So saith *Theophylact* on the place; ἀ πιστεῖ τοῖς γεγραμμένοις; πῶς πιστεύσῃ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐῤῥήτοις ῥήμασι?

3. *Protestants* believe and profess, *that the End*

wherefore God gave forth his Word by Inſpiration, was that it might be a ſtable Infallible Revelation of his mind and will, as to that knowledge which he would have mankind entertain of him, with that Worſhip and Obedience which he requireth of them, that ſo they may pleaſe him in this world, and come unto the fruition of him unto all eternity. God who is the *formal object*, is alſo the *prime Cauſe* of all Religious worſhip. What is *due* unto him as the *firſt Cauſe*, laſt End, and Soveraign Lord of all, as to the ſubſtance of it, and what he further *appoints* himſelf, as to the *manner* of its performance, ſuited unto his own Holineſs, and the Condition wherein in reference unto our *laſt end* we ſtand and are, making up the whole of it. That he hath given his *Word* to reveal theſe things unto us, to be our *Rule*, Guide, and Direction in our wayes, walkings, and univerſal deportment before him, is, as I take it, a *fundamentall Principle* of our Chriſtian Profeſſion. Neither do I know that this is denied by *your Church*; although you ſtartle at the inferences that are *juſtly* made from it. I ſhall not need therefore to adde any thing in its *Confirmation*, but only mind you again, that the calling of it into *queſtion*, is directly againſt the very *heart* of all Religion, and the unanimous conſent of all that in the world are called *Chriſtians*, or ever were ſo. Yea, and it muſt be granted, or the whole Scripture eſteemed a *Fable*, becauſe it frequently declares, that it is given unto us of God for this End and Purpoſe. And hence do Proteſtants inferre two other *Concluſions*, on which they build their Perſwaſion concerning the *Unity of Faith*, and the proper means of their *Settlement* therein.

1. *That* therefore *the Scripture is perfect and every way compleat*; namely with reſpect unto that *end* wherunto

whereunto of God it is deſigned. A *Perfect and compleat Revelation of the Will of God* as to his Worſhip, and our Obedience. And we cannot but wonder that any who profeſs themſelves to *believe* that it was given for the *end* mentioned, ſhould not have that ſacred *Reverence* for the Wiſdome, Goodneſs, and Love of its Author unto mankind, as freely *to aſſent* unto this Inference and Concluſion, *He is our Rock, and his work is perfect.* And leſt any men ſhould pleaſe themſelves in the imagination of *contributing* any thing towards the effecting of the end of his Word, by a *ſupply* unto it, he hath ſtrictly *forbidden* them any ſuch addition, *Deut.* 4.2. & 12.12. *Prov.* 30. 6. Which if it were not compleat in reference unto its *proper End*, would hold no great *correſpondency* with that Love and goodneſs which the ſame Word every where declares to be in Him. I ſuppoſe, you know with how many *expreſs Teſtimonies* of Scripture its ſelf, this Truth is confirmed, which, added unto that *light and evidence*, which as a *deduction* from the former *fundamental Truth* it hath in its ſelf, is very ſufficient to render it unqueſtionable. You may at your leaſure, beſides thoſe forenamed conſult, *Pſal.* 19.8. *Eſa.* 8.20. *Ezek.* 28.18. *Mat.* 15.6. *Luk.* 1.3,4. *ch.* 16.29,31. *ch.* 24.25, 27. *Joh.* 5.39. *ch.* 20.10 *Act.* 1. 11. *ch.* 17.2,3. *ch.* 20.27. *chapt.* 26.22. *Rom.* 10.17. *ch.* 15.4. 1 *Cor.* 4. 6. *Gal.* 1.8. *Eph.* 2. 19,20. 2 *Tim.* 3.16,17. *Heb.* 1.1. 2 *Pet.* 1.19. *Rev* 22.18. For though *Texts* of Scripture are not appointed for us to *throw at one anothers heads* as you talk in your *Fiat*, yet they are for us to *uſe* and inſiſt on in the Confirmation of the Truth; if we may take the *example* of Chriſt and all his Apoſtles, for our warrant. And it were endleſs to recite the *full* and *plain Teſtimonies*, of the Ancient Fathers and

Councels to this purpose. Neither is that my present design; though I did somewhat occasionally *that way*, upon the former Principle. It shall suffice me to shew, that the *denyall* of this Assertion also, as it is inferred from the foregoing *Principle*, is Prejudiciall, if not *pernicious* to Christian Religion in Generall. The whole of our *Faith* and *Profession* is resolved into the *known Excellencies* and Perfections of the Nature of God. Amongst these, there are none that have a more *immediate* and quickning influence into them, than his *Wisdom*, *Goodness*, *Grace*, *Care* and *Love* towards them, unto whom he is pleased to reveal himself. Nor is there any *property* of his *Nature* that in his Word he more frequently gives testimony unto. And all of them doth he declare himself to have *exalted* and glorified in a signall manner, in that *Revelation*, which he hath made of himself, his Mind and Will therein. I suppose, this cannot be denied by *any*, who hath the least sense of the importance of the things revealed. Now, if the *Revelation* made for the End before proposed be not *perfect* and compleat, that is *sufficient* to enable a man to *know* so much of God his Mind and Will, and to *direct* him so in his Worship and Obedience unto him, as that he may *please him* here, and come to the *fruition* of him hereafter; it must needs become an evident means of *deceiving him*, and ruining him, and that to all eternity. And the least fear of any such *event*, overthrows all the *notions* which he had before entertained of those blessed *Properties* of the Divine Nature, and so consequently disposeth him unto *Atheism*. For if a man hath once received the Scripture as the *Word of God*, and that given unto him to be *his guide* unto Heaven, by God himself; if one shall come to him and tell him, Yea but it is not *a perfect Guide*,

but

but though you ſhould attend ſincerely to all the *Directions* that it gives you, yet you may come ſhort of your *Duty* and Expectation; you may neither *pleaſe* God here, nor come to the *fruition* of Him hereafter: In caſe he ſhould aſſent unto this *ſuggeſtion*, can he entertain any other thoughts of God, but ſuch as our *firſt Parents* did, when by attendance unto the falſe inſinuations of the *old Serpent*, they caſt off his Soveraignty, and their dependance on him? Neither can you relieve him againſt ſuch thoughts by your pretended *Traditionall ſupply*; ſeeing it will ſtill be impoſſible for him to look on this *Revelation* of the Will of God, as *imperfect and inſufficient* for the End, for which it plainly profeſſeth its ſelf to be given forth by him, without ſome *intrenchment* on thoſe notions of his Nature which he had before received. For it will preſently occurr unto him, that ſeeing this *Way of revealing* himſelf for the Ends mentioned, is *good* and approved of Himſelf ſo to be, if he hath not made it *compleat* for that end, it was either becauſe he *could not*, and where then is his *Wiſdome*; or becauſe he would not, and where then is his *Love, Care, and Goodneſs*; and ſeeing, he ſaith, *he hath done*, what you would have him to believe, that *he hath not done*, where is his *Truth* and Veracity? Certainly a man that ſeriouſly ponders what he hath to do, and knows the vanity of an irrationall *fanatical Credo*, will conclude, that either the Scripture is to be *received* as *Perfect*, or not to be received at all.

2. Proteſtants conclude hence, *That the Scripture given of God for this purpoſe is intelligible unto men, uſing the means by God appointed to come to the underſtanding of his Mind and Will therein.* I know many of your way are pleaſed grievouſly to miſtake

our *intention in* this Inference and Concluſion. Sometimes they would impoſe upon us to ſay, that *All places of Scripture, all words and ſentences* in it are *plain*, and of an obvious ſenſe, and eaſie to be underſtood. And yet this you *know*, or *may* know if you pleaſe, and I am ſure *ought* to know, before you talk of theſe things with us, that we abſolutely deny. It is one thing to ſay, that all *neceſſary Truth* is plainly and clearly revealed in the Scripture, which we do ſay; and another that *every text and paſſage* in the Scripture is plain and eaſie to be underſtood, which we do not ſay; nor ever thought, as confeſſing that to ſay ſo, were to contradict our own *experience*, and that of the Diſciples of Chriſt in all ages. Sometimes you faign, as though we *aſſerted* all the *things that are revealed* in the Scripture, to be plain and obvious to every mans underſtanding; whereas we acknowledge that the *things themſelves* revealed are many of them *myſterious*, ſurpaſſing the comprehenſion of any man in this world; and only maintain that the *propoſitions* wherein the Revelation of them is made, are *plain and intelligible* unto them that uſe the means appointed of God to come to a right underſtanding of them. And ſometimes you would commit this with *another Principle* of ours; whereby we aſſert that the *ſupernaturall Light of Grace* to be wrought in our hearts by the Holy Ghoſt, is neceſſary to give unto us a *ſaving perception* and underſtanding of the Mind of God in the Scripture; for what needs ſuch *ſpeciall aſſiſtance* in ſo plain a matter? as though the aſſerting of *perſpicuity* in the *object*, made ability to diſcern in the *ſubject* altogether unneceſſary: Or that he who affirms the Sun to give *light*, doth at the ſame time affirm alſo that men have no need of *eyes* to ſee it withall. Beſides

sides we know there is a vast difference between a *notionall speculative apprehension*, and perception of the meaning and Truth of the Propositions contained in the Scripture, which we acknowledge that every *reasonable unprejudiced Person* may attain unto; and a gracious *saving spirituall perception* of them, and assent unto them with faith Divine and Supernatural; and this we say is the especiall work of the Holy Ghost in the hearts of the Elect. And I know not how many other *exceptions* you make to keep your selves from a *right understanding* of our intention in this Inference; but, as your self elsewhere learnedly observes, *who so blind as he that will not see?* I shall therefore once more, that we may proceed, declare unto you *what it is* that we intend in this Assertion. It is, namely; that *the things which are revealed in the Scripture*, to the end that by the belief of them, and obedience unto them, we may *please* God, are so *proposed and declared*, that a man, *any man*, free from prejudices and temptations; in and by the use of the *means* appointed him of God for that purpose, may come to the *understanding* (and that infallibly) of *all* that God would have him *know* or *do* in Religion; there being no defect or hinderance in *the Scripture*, or manner of its revealing things necessary, that should *obstruct* him therein. What are the *means* appointed of God for this purpose, we do not *now* enquire, but shall *anon* declare. What *defect*, blindness, or darkness, there is, or may be, in and upon the *minds* of men in their depraved *lapsed* Condition, what disadvantages they may be cast under by their *prejudices*, *Traditions*, negligences, sins, and prophaneness, belongs not unto our present disquisition. That which we assert concerns meerly the *manner of the proposall of the Truths* to be believed, which

which are revealed in the Scripture; and this we say is such, as that there is *no impossibility*, no nor great difficulty, but that a man may come to the *right understanding* of them; not as to the *comprehension* of the things themselves, but the *perception* of the sense of the *Propositions* wherein they are expressed. And this Assertion of ours, is, as the former, *grounded* on the Scripture its self. See if you please, *Deut.* 30. 11. *Psal.* 19.9. and 119.105. *Prov.* 6.22. 2 *Cor.* 4. 3. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. And to deny it, is to pluck up all Religion by the roots, and to turn men loose unto *Scepticism*, *Libertinism*, and *Atheism*; and that with such an horrible *reproach* unto God himself, as that nothing more abominable can be invented. The *Devil* of old, being not able to give out *certain* Answers unto them that came to enquire about their Concernments at his *Oracles*, put them off a long time with dubious, *anigmaticall*, unintelligible Sophisms. But when once the world had by *experience*, study, and observation, improved its self into a *Wisdome* beyond the pitch of its first *rudeness*, men began generally to *despise* what they saw could not be certainly understood. This made the *Devil* pluck in his horns, as not finding it for the interest of his kingdome to expose himself to be *scoffed* at by them, with whose follies and *fanaticall* credulity in esteeming *highly* of that which could not be understood, he had for many generations sported himself. And do they not *blasphemously* expose the *Oracles* of the true, holy, and living God, to no less contempt, who for their own *sinister* ends would frighten men from them with the ugly scare-crow of *obscurity*, or their not being *intelligible* unto every man by the use of means, so far as he is concerned to know them, and the mind of God in them. And herein also Protestants

stand

stand as firmly as the fundamentals of Christianity will bear them.

4. Protestants believe, that *it is the Duty of all men who desire to know the Will of God, and to Worship him according unto his mind, to use diligence in the improvement of the means appointed for that end, to come unto a right and full understanding of all things in the Scripture, wherein their faith and obedience are concerned.* This *necessarily* follows from the Principles before laid down. Nor is it *possible* it should be otherwise. It is doubtless incumbent on every man to *study* and know his *Duty*; that cannot be a mans *Duty* which he is not bound to know, especially not such a *Duty* as whereon his eternall welfare should depend: And I suppose a man can take no better Course to come to the knowledge of his *Duty*, than that which God hath appointed for that purpose. The *Commands* and *Exhortations* which we have given us in the Scripture for our *Diligence* in this matter, with the Explications and improvements of them in the *Writings* of the Fathers, are so obvious, trite, and known, that it were meer loss of time to insist on the Repetition of them. I suppose, I should speak within compass, if I should say, that one *Chrysostome* doth in a *hundred places* exhort Christians of all sorts, to the diligent study and search of the Scriptures, and especially of the Epistles of *Paul*, not the most plain and easie part of them. I know, the *practise* of your Church lyes to the contrary, and what you plead in the justification of that practise; but I am sorry both for Her and you; both for the *contrivers* of and *consenters* unto this abomination: and I fear what your *account* will be as to this matter, at the last day. God having granted the *inestimable benefit of his Word* unto mankind, revealing therein unto them the

the *only way* by which they may attain unto a bleſſed eternity; Is it not the greateſt *ingratitude* that any man can poſſibly contract the guilt of, to *neglect* the uſe of it? What then is your Condition, who, upon ſleight and *triviall* pretences, ſet up your own Wiſdome and Authority, againſt the Wiſdome and Authority of God; adviſing and *commanding* men, upon the pain of *your diſpleaſure* in this world, not to attend unto that which God commands them to attend unto, on pain of *his diſpleaſure* in the world to come? So that though I confeſs that you *deny* this Principle, yet I cannot ſee but that you do ſo, not only upon the *hazard* of your own ſouls, and the ſouls of them that attend unto you, ſeeing, *that if the blind lead the blind, both muſt fall into the ditch*; but alſo, that you do it to the great *prejudice* of Chriſtian Religion in the very foundations of it. For what can a man rationally conclude, that ſhall ſee you *driving all Perſons*, and that on no ſmall penalties, excepting *your ſelves* who are concerned in the conſpiracy, and ſome *few others* whom you ſuppoſe ſufficiently *initiated in your Myſteries*, from the reading and ſtudy of thoſe Books, wherein the world knows, and your ſelves confeſs, that the *Arcana* of Chriſtian Religion are contained; but that there are ſome things in them like the *hidden Sacra* of the old *Pagan Hierophants*, which may not be diſcloſed, becauſe however countenanced by a remote veneration, yet are indeed *turpia* or *ridicula*, things to be *aſhamed* of, or *ſcorned*? And the Truth is, ſome of your *Doctors* have ſpoken very *ſuſpiciouſly* this way; whileſt they juſtifie your practiſe in *driving* the people from the ſtudy of the Scripture, by intimations of things and expreſſions, not ſo *pure* and *chaſt* as to be fit for the knowledg of the promiſcuous multitude; when

in

in the mean time Themselves or their *Associates* do publish unto all the world in their *rules and directions for Confession*, such abominable filth and ribaldry, as I think was never by any other means vented amongst mankind.

5. Protestants say *that the Lord Christ hath instituted his Church, and therein appointed a Ministry, to preside over the rest of his Disciples in his Name, and to unfold unto them his mind and will as recorded in his Word*; for which end he hath promised his *presence* with them by his Spirit unto the *end of the world*, to enable them *in an humble dependance* on his assistance, to find out and declare his Commands and Appointments unto their brethren. This Position, I suppose, you will not *contend* with us about; although I know that you put *another sense* upon most of the terms of it, than the Scripture will allow, or wee can admit of.

These are the *Principles* of Protestants; this is the Progress of their Faith in coming unto *settlement* and assurance. These are their Foundations, which are as *unquestionable* as any thing in Christianity; the *most* of them, your selves being judges. And from them, one of these two things will *necessarily* follow; Either that all men, unto whom the Word of God doth come, will come to an *agreement* in the Truth, or the Unity of Faith; or Secondly, That it is their *own fault* if they do not so do: For what upon these Principles should hinder them from so doing? *All saving Truth* is revealed by God in the Scripture, unto *the end* that men may come to the knowledge of it. It is *so revealed* by Him, that it is *possible*, and, with his assistance, *easie* for men to know aright his Mind and Will about the things so revealed: and he hath appointed *regular ways* and means for men

to

to wait upon him in and by, for the *obtaining* of his assistance. Now pray revive your *Question* that gave occasion unto this discourse; however men may *differ in Religion*, why is not the Scripture *sufficient* to bring them unto an agreement and settlement? Take heed that in your *Answer*, you deny not some Principle that will *involve* the whole interest of Christianity in its ruine: Where is the defect? where the hinderance, why all men upon these Principles however *differing* at present, may not come to a full Settlement and Agreement? I hope, you will find *none* but what are in them selves; and for them; *ipsi viderint*; the Scripture is blameless. Here is *Certainty* of Revelation from God, *Fullness* of that Revelation as to our Duty, *Clearness* and perspicuity for our understanding of it, *Means* appointed and sanctified for that end; what I pray is wanting? All Truths wherein it is the Duty of men to agree are *fixed* and stated, so that it can never be *lawfull* for any man, in any generation, to call any of them into question; *plain* and evident, that no man can mistake the mind of God in them in things wherein his Duty is concerned, without his own *crime* and guilt. You will say then, it may be, *But why then do not men agree, why do you not agree among your selves*, but I would hope, that it is scarcely possible for any man to be so *ignorant* of the *Condition* of mankind, and amongst them of the *best* of men, as seriously to ask this Question. Are not all men *naturally blind* in the things of God? Do not the *best of men* know only in part? have not the different *tempers*, constitutions, and Educations of men, a great influence upon their understandings and judgements? Besides do not *Lusts*, Corruptions, *Carnall Interests*, and Respect unto Worldly things bear sway in the minds of many

many that profess Christian Religion? Are not many prepossessed with *prejudices*, *traditions*, customes and usages against the Truth? And are not these things and the like, *sufficient* to keep up variance in the world without the least suspition of any *disability* in the Scripture to bring them to an holy *agreement* and immoveable *Settlement*? Neither is there any *other way* for men to come unto *Settlement* and Agreement in Religion according to the mind of God, but that only which hath been now proposed, and this they *will come* unto, when all men shall be perswaded to *captivate their understandings* to the obedience of Faith. I deny not but that by *outward force* and compulsion, by *supine negligence* of their own concernments, by refusing to *bethink* themselves, and such other wayes and means, some men may come to *some Agreement* amongst themselves in the things of Religion. But this *Agreement*, we say, is not of God, it is not built upon the τὸ βεβαίον τῆς πίστεως εἰς Θεόν, *the foundation of faith towards God*, and so is of no *esteem* with him. That such is all the *Unity* which on your Principles you are able to bring men unto, wee shall manifest in our next Discourse. For the present, I dare *challenge* you, or any man in the world, to question or oppose any one of the *Principles* before laid down; and which whileſt they *stand firm*, it is evident unto all, how the Scripture is able to *settle* men unquestionably in the Truth and that for ever; ἕως ἀεὶ μένει. I shall close this Discourse with a passage out of *Chrysostome*, which fully confirms all that I have asserted; it is in *Homil* 33. *in Act. Apost. Chap.* 15. Τί οὖν, saith he, ἐρεῖ τις τοῖς Ἕλλησι; ἔρχεται Ἕλλην, καὶ λέγει ὅτι βούλομαι γενέσθαι χριστιανὸς, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα. *What shall wee say unto the Gentiles? A Gentile cometh and saith, I would be a Christian, but I know*

know not unto whom amongst you I should adhere. Let us hear the reasons of his hæsitation; saith hee, Μάχη παρ' ὑμῖν πολλὴ καὶ στάσις, πολὺς διχυβὸς. πῖον ἕλωμαι δόγμα; τί διερήσομαι; ἕκαστος λέγει ὅτι ἀληθεύω. τίνι πιστεύω; μηδὲν ὅλως εἰδὼς ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν. *There are many contentions, seditions, and tumults amongst you: what opinion to choose I know not: every one sayes, I am in the Truth; and I am utterly ignorant of what is in the Scripture about these things.* Do you know *whose* Objections these are, and by whom they have been lately managed? Will you hear what *Chrysostome* answers? Saith he, παύεται τοῦτο ὑμῶν. εἰ μὲν γὰρ λογισμοῖς ἐλέγομεν πιθεσθαι, εἰκότως ἐταράττου. εἰδὲ ταῖς γραφαῖς λέγομεν πιστεύειν, αὗται δὲ ἁπλαῖ καὶ ἀληθεῖς, εὐχολόν σοι τὸ κριτήριον. ὃς τις ἐκείναις συμφωνεῖ. οὗτος χριστιανός. ὃς τις μάχεται, οὗτος πόρρω τοῦ κανόνος τούτου. *This makes wholly for us; for if wee should say, that wee believe on probable reasonings, thou maist justly be troubled: but seeing wee profess that we believe in the Scriptures, which are plain and true, it is easie for thee to judg and determine. He that yeilds his consent unto them, he is a Christian; and he that contends against them, is farre from the Rule of Christianity.* And in the process of his Discourse, which is well worth the perusall before you write any more *familiar Epistles*, he requires no more of a man to settle him in the Truth, but that he *receive the Scripture* and have νοῦν καὶ κρίσιν, *a mind and judgment*, to use in the consideration of it.

It remaineth now that wee consider *what it is* that you propose unto men to bring them unto a *Settlement* in Religion, and all Christians to the *Unity of Faith*, with the Principles that you proceed upon to that purpose: which because I would not too far lengthen out this Discourse, I shall refer to the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Principles of Papiſts whereon they proceed in bringing men to a Settlement in Religion and the Unity of Faith; examined.

YOur Plea to this purpoſe is blended with *a double* pretence of *Pope*, and *Church*. Sometimes you tell us of the *Pope* and his ſucceſſion to St *Peter*; And ſometimes of the *Church* and its Authority. Sometimes you ſpeak as if *both* theſe were one and the ſame; And ſometimes you ſeem to diſtinguiſh them. Some of you, lay moſt weight upon the *Papall ſucceſſion* and *Infallibility*; and ſome on the Churches *Juriſdiction* and *Authority*. I ſhall crave leave to take your *pleas a-ſunder*: and firſt to conſider what force they have in them as unto the End whereunto they are applied, *ſeverally and apart*; and then ſee what in their *joint concurrence* they can contribute thereunto. And what ever *you think* of it, I ſuppoſe this courſe of proceeding will pleaſe *ingenuous perſons*, and Lovers of Truth; becauſe it enables them to take a *diſtinct view* of the things whereon they are to give judgment. Whereas in your handling of them, ſomething you *ſuppoſe*, ſomething you *inſinuate*, ſomething you *openly averr*, yet ſo confound them with other *heterogenious* Diſcourſes that it can hardly be diſcerned what *grounds* you build upon. A way of proceeding, which as it argues a *ſecret guilt* and fear of bringing forth your Principles to Light, ſo a groſs kind of *Sophiſtry*, exploded by all Maſters of Reaſon whatſoever. They would not have us *fumum ex fulgore, ſed ex fumo*

dare lucem, darken things clear and perſpicuous in themſelves; but to make things dark and confuſed, perſpicuous. And the Orator tells us, that *Epicurus* his diſcourſe was ambiguous, becauſe his *Sententia* was *inhoneſta*, his *Opinion ſhamefull*. And to what purpoſe ſhould any one contend with you about ſuch generall ambiguous expreſſions; ὥσπερ ἐν νυκτομαχίᾳ; I ſhall then begin with the *Pope* and his *Infallibility*, becauſe you ſeem to lay moſt weight thereon and tell us plainly, pag. 379 of your Fiat, Edit. 2d, *That if the Pope be not an unerring guide in Affairs of Religion, all is loſt*; And that, *A man once rid of his Authority, may as eaſily deride, and as ſolidly confute the Incarnation, as the Sprinkling of Holy water*; ſo reſolving our faith of the *Incarnation of Chriſt* into his Authority or Teſtimony: Yea and in the ſame page; *That if it had not been for the Pope, Chriſt himſelf had not been taken in the world for any ſuch Perſon, as he is believed this day*: And p. 378. to the ſame purpoſe; *The firſt great fundamental of Chriſtian Religion, which is the Truth and Divinity of Chriſt, had it not been for him, had failed long ago in the world*; with much more to the ſame purpoſe. Hence it is evident that in your judgment, *all Truth and Certainty in Religion* depends on the *Popes Authority and Infallibility*; or, as you expreſs it, his *unerring guidance*. This is your *Principle*, this you propoſe as the only *medium* to bring us unto that *Settlement* in Religion, which you ſuppoſe the Scripture is *not able* to do. What courſe ſhould we now take? would you have us believe you at the firſt word without *further triall* or examination? would you have a man to do ſo, who never before heard of *Pope* or *Church*? We are commanded *to try all things, and to hold faſt that which is good*; to try pretending Spirits: and the *Be-*

reans

reans are commended for *examining* by the Scripture, what *Paul* himself preached unto them: An *implicit Credulity* given up to such Dictates, is the height of *Fanaticism*. Have wee not reason then to call you and your copartners in this design to an *account* how you prove that which you so strenuously assert and suppose; and to examine the Principles of that Authority whereunto you *resolve* all your faith and Religion. If upon mature consideration, these prove *Solid*, and the Inferences you make from them *Cogent*, it is good Reason that you should be attended unto. If they prove otherwise; if the first be *false*, and the latter *Sophistical*; you cannot justly take it ill of him that shall advise you to take heed, that whilest you are gloriously *displaying* your Colours, the ground that you stand upon do not *sink* under your feet. And here you are forced to go many a *step backward* to fix your first footing, (untill you leave your *Pope* quite out of sight) from whence you advance towards him by severall degrees, and so arive at his Supremacie and Infallibility; and so we shall have —— *Reditum Diomedis ab interitu Meleagri.*

I. Your first Principle to this purpose is, *That Peter was the Prince of the Apostles, and that in him the Lord Jesus founded a Monarchy in his Church.* So *pag.* 360. you call him, *the head and Prince of the whole Congregation.* Now this wee think no *meet* Principle for any one to begin withall, in asserting the foundation of Faith and Religion: Nor do we think that if it were *meet* so to be used, that it is any way *subservient* unto your design and purpose.

1. *A Principle, fundamental, or first entrance into any way of Settlement in Faith or Religion, it cannot possibly be*; because it presupposeth the knowledg of,

and assent unto many other *great fundamental Articles* of Christian Religion; yea upon the matter all that are so: For before you can rationally talk with a man about *Peters Principality*, and the *Monarchical state* of the Church hereon depending, you must suppose that he *believes the Scripture* to be the Word of God, and all things that are taught therein concerning *Jesus Christ*, his Person, Nature, Offices, Work, and Gospell, to be certainly and infallibly true: for they are all *supposed* in your Assertion; which without the knowledg of them is *uncouth*, horrid, insignificant, and forraign to all notions that a man can *rationally* entertain of God or Religion: Nay no *attempt* of proof or confirmation can be given unto it, but by and from *Scripture*. whereby you fall directly into the Principle which you seek so carefully to avoid: namely that the *Scripture* is the only way and means of *setling* us in the Truth; since you cannot *settle* any man in the very first proposition which you make to lead him into *another* way but by the Scripture: So powerfull is Truth, that those who will not *follow* it willingly, it will lead them *captive* in Triumph, whether they will or no.

2. *It is unmeet for any purpose, because it is not true.* No *one word* from the Scripture can you produce in its confirmation: wherein yet if it be not revealed, it must pass as a very *uncertain* and frivolous conjecture. You can produce no *suffrage* of the Ancient Church unto your purpose; which yet if you could, would not presently render any Assertion so confirmed *infallibly* certain, much less fundamental. Some indeed of the 4th Century call *Peter*, *Principem Apostolorum*: but explain themselves to intend thereby τὸν πρῶτον, the *first* or Leader, not τὸν ἀρχοντα the *Prince*,

Prince, or *Ruler*. And when the *ambiguity* of that word began to be *abuſed* unto pretenſions of Pre-eminence, the Council of *Carthage* expreſly condemned it, allowing none to be termed *Princeps Sacerdotum*. Many in thoſe dayes thought *Peter* to be among the Apoſtles like the *Princeps Senatus*, or *Princeps Civitatis*, the chief in their Aſſemblies, or Principall in dignity, how truly I know not; but that he ſhould be amongſt them and over them a *Prince in Office*, a *Monarch* as to Rule and Power, is a thing that they never once dreamed of; and the Aſſeveration of it is an *open* untruth. The Apoſtles were equall in their *Call*, *Office*, *Place*, *Dignity*, *Employments*: All the difference between them was in their *Labours*, Sufferings, and Succeſs; wherein *Paul* ſeems to have had the pre-eminence; who as *Peter*, and all the reſt of the Apoſtles, every one *ſingly* and for himſelf, had the *care of all the Churches* committed unto him; though it may be for the better diſcharge of their *Duty*, ordinarily they divided their work, as they found it neceſſary for them to apply themſelves unto it in particular. See 2 *Cor.* 11. And this *equality* between the Apoſtles is more than once inſinuated by *Paul*, and that with ſpeciall reference unto *Peter*, 1 Cor. 1. Gal. 1. 18, 19. ch. 2. 9. And is it not wonderfull, that if this *Aſſertion* ſhould not only be *true*, but ſuch a Truth as on which the whole faith of the Church was to be *built*, that the Scripture ſhould be utterly *ſilent* of it, that it ſhould give us no *Rules* about it, no *directions* to uſe and improve it, afford us no *one inſtance* of the exerciſe of the Power and Authority intimated, no not one? but that on the contrary it ſhould lay down Principles *excluſive* of it; *Matth.* 22. 25, 26. *Luk.* 22. 26. And when it comes to make an *enumeration* of all the

Offices appointed by Christ in his Church, *Eph.* 4. 11. should pass over the *Prince* and his Office in silence, on which all the rest were to depend? You see what a *Foundation* you begin to build upon; a meer imagination, and *groundless* presumption which hath not the least countenance given unto it by Scripture or Antiquity. What a *perplexed condition* must you needs cast men into, if they shall attend unto your perswasions to rest on the Pope's *unerring guidance* for all their Certainty in Religion, when the *first motive* you propose unto them to gain their Assent, is a Proposition so far *destitute* of any cogent Evidence of its Truth or innate Credibility, that it is *apparently false*, and easily manifested so to be.

3. Were it never so true, as it is notoriously false, *yet it would not one jot promote your design:* It is about *Peter* the Apostle, and not the *Pope* of *Rome*, that we are yet discoursing. Do you think a man can easily commence *per saltum*, from the imaginary Principality of *Peter* unto the Infallibility of the *present Pope* of *Rome*? *Quid Papæ cum Petro?* what relation is there between the one and other? Suppose a man have so good a *mind unto your company*, as to be willing to set out with you in this *ominous stumbling at the threshold*, what will you next lead him unto? You say

II. *That* St Peter *besides his Apostolical Power and Office, (wherein setting aside the prerogative of his Princedome before mentioned, the rest of the Apostles were partakers with him,) had also an Oecumenical Episcopal Power invested in him, which was to be transmitted unto others after him.* His Office purely *Apostolical*, you have no mind to lay claim unto. It may be, you dispair of being able to prove, that your *Pope* is *immediately called* and sent by Christ: that

that he is furnished with a power of *working Miracles*, and such other things as concurred to the constitution of the Office *Apostolical*: and perhaps himself hath but little mind to be exercised in the *discharge* of that Office, by travelling up and down, *poor*, despised, persecuted, to preach the Gospel: *Monarchy*, *Rule*, *Supremacie*, *Authority*, *Jurisdiction*, *Infallibility*, are words that better please him: And therefore have you mounted this Notion of *Peters Episcopacy*, whereunto you would have us think that all the *fine things* you so love and dote upon, are annexed. Poor, labouring, persecuted *Peter* the *Apostle*, may die and be forgotten: but *Peter* the *Bishop*, *harnessed* with Power, Principality, Soveraignty, and Vicarship of Christ,. This is the man you enquire after: But you will have very *hard work* to find him in the Scripture, or Antiquity, yea the least footstep of him. And do you think indeed that this *Episcopacy* of *Peter*, distinct from his *Apostleship*, is a *meet stone* to be layed in the foundation of faith? It is a thing that plainly overthrows his *Apostleship*; For if he were a *Bishop*, *properly* and distinctly, he was no *Apostle*: If an *Apostle*, not such a *Bishop*: That is, if his *Care* were *confined* unto any one Church, and his *residence* required therein, as the Case is with a *proper Bishop*, how could the *Care of all the Churches* be upon him? How could he be *obliged* to pass up and down the world in pursuit of his Commission of *preaching the Gospel unto all Nations*? or to travail up and down as the *necessity* of the Churches did require? But you will say, that he was not *Bishop* of this or that particular, but of the *Church Universal*. But I supposed you had thought him Bishop of the *Church* of *Rome*, and that you will plead him afterwards so to have been: And I must assure you, that

he that thinks the *Church* of *Rome* in the dayes of *Peter* and *Paul* was the same with the *Church Catholick*, and not looked on as *particular* a Church as that of *Hierusalem*, or *Ephesus*, or *Corinth*; is a person with whom I will have as little to do as I can in this matter. For to what purpose should any one spend time to debate things, with men *absurd* and unreasonable, and who will affirm that it is midnight at noon day? I know, the *Apostolical* Office did include in it the power of all other *Offices* in the Church whatever, as the less are included in the greater: But that he who was an *Apostle* should *formally* also be a *Bishop*, though an Apostle might exercise the whole Power and Office of a *Bishop*, is ἐν τῶν ἀδυνάτων, somewhat allyed unto *Impossibilities*. Do you see what a *Quagmire* you are building upon? I know, if a man will let you alone you will raise a *structure*, which after you have painted and gilded, you may prevail with many *harbourless* Creatures to accept of an habitation therein: For when you have layed your foundation *out of sight*, you will pretend that all your building is on *a Rock*, whereas indeed you have nothing but the *rotten posts* of such Suppositions as these, to support it withall. But suppose that *Peter* was thus a *Prince*, *Monarch*, *Apostle*, *Bishop*, that is, a *Catholick*, *Particular Officer*, What is that to you? Why

III. *This Peter came and preached the Gospel at Rome.* Though you can by no means prove this Assertion, so as to make it *de fide*, or *necessarily* to be believed of any one man in the world, much less to become meet to enjoy a place among those *fundamentals* that are tendred unto us to bring us unto *Settlement* in Religion; yet being a matter very *uncertain*, and of little importance, I shall not much contend

tend with you about it. Witneſſes meerly *humane* and fallible you have for it a great many; and *exceptions* almoſt without number may be put in againſt your *Teſtimonies*, and thoſe of great weight and moment. Now although that which you affirm might be granted you, without any reall *advantage* unto your Cauſe, or the enabling of you to draw any lawfull inferences to uphold your *Papal* claim by, yet to let you ſee on what ſorry *uncertain* preſumptions you build your faith and profeſſion, and that in and about things which you make of *indiſpenſable* neceſſity unto Salvation; I ſhall in our paſſage remind you of ſome few of them, which I profeſs ſeriouſly unto you, make it not only *Queſtionable* unto me whether or no, but alſo ſomewhat *improbable* that ever *Peter* came to *Rome*. 1. Though thoſe that follow and give their aſſents unto this Story are *many*, yet it was taken up upon the credit and report of *one* or *two* Perſons, as *Euſebius* manifeſts, *Lib.2.cap.25*. Whether *Dionyſius Corinthius*, or *Papias*, firſt began the Story, I know not; but I know certainly that both of them manifeſted themſelves in other things, to be a little *too credulous*. 2. That which many of them built their *Credulity* upon, is very uncertain, if not certainly falſe; namely that *Peter* wrote his *firſt Epiſtle* from *Rome*, which he calls *Babylon* in the Subſcription of it. But wherefore he ſhould then ſo call it, no man can tell. The *Apocalypſe* of *John* who propheſied what *Rome* ſhould be in after-Ages, and thereon what *name* ſhould be accommodated unto it for its falſe worſhip and perſecution, was not yet written. Nor was there any thing yet ſpoken of or known among the *Diſciples*, whence they might conjecture *Rome* to be intended by that Appellation. So that according

ding

ding unto this Supposition, St *Peter* intending to acquaint them unto whom he wrote, *where* he was, when he wrote unto them, and to present them with the respects of the *Church* in that place, had by an *enigmatical* expression rather *amused* than informed them. Besides, he had before this, *agreed* with and solemnly engaged himself unto *Paul* to take care of the *Circumcision*; unto whom after he had preached a while in *Palestine*, it is more than probable that he betook himself unto *Babylon* in *Assyria*, the principal seat of their residence in their first and most populous *dispersion*, from whence he wrote unto all their *Colonies* scattered abroad in the neighbouring Nations. So that although I will not, because of the consent of many of the *Ancients*, deny that *Peter* went to *Rome* and preached there, yet I am fully satisfied that this *foundation* of the Story told by them, is a perfect mistake, consisting in an unwarrantable causeless wresting of a *plain* expression unto a *mystical* sense and meaning. 3. Your Witnesses agree not at all in their Story; neither as to the *time* of his going to *Rome*, nor as to the *occasion* of it, nor as to the *season* of his abode there. Many of them assign unto him 25 years for his residence there, which is evidently false and easily disproved. This computation is ascribed to *Eusebius* in *Chron. Lib.* 1. but it is evidently an addition of *Hieroms*, in whose dayes the Tradition was encreased; for there is no such thing in the *Original Greek Copy of Eusebius*, nor doth it agree with what he had elsewhere written concerning him. And it is very well worth while, to consider how *Onuphrius Panvinus*, a very learned *Antiquary* of your own party, makes up these 25 years of *Peter's* Episcopacy at *Rome*, *Annotat. in Plat. in Vit. B. Petr. Ex novem primis annis*, saith he, *post Christi*

Christi mortem usque ad initium secundi anni Imperii *Claudii, Petrum Judæa nunquam excessisse, ex Actis Apostolorum, & Pauli Epistola ad Galatas, apertissimè constat. Si igitur, ut inter omnes Authores convenit, eo tempore Romam venit, illud certe necessarium videtur eum ante ad urbem adventum Antiochiæ septem annis non sedisse, sed hanc ejus Antiochenam cathedram alio tempore fuisse. Quam rem ex vetustissimorum authorum testimonio sic constituo. Secundo Imperii Claudii anno Romam venit, à quo tempore usque ad illius obitum, anni plus minus viginti quinque interfuerunt, quibus etsi eum Roma sedisse Veteres scribunt, non tamen præterea sequitur, ipsum semper in urbe commoratum esse. Nam, quarto anno ejus ad urbem adventum, Hierusolymam reversus est, & ibi Concilio Apostolorum interfuit; inde Antiochiam profectus septem ibidem annis usque ad Neronis Imperium permansit, cujus initio Romam reversus Romanam dilabentem reparavit Ecclesiam. Peregrinatione inde per universam fere Europam susceptâ, Romam rediens novissimo Neronis Imperii anno, martyrium Crucis passus est.*

For the first nine years after the death of Christ, unto the beginning of the second year of Claudius, *it is most evident from the Acts, and Epistle to the Galatians, that* Peter *went not out of* Palestine. *If therefore, as all agree, he came at that time to* Rome, *it is certain that he had not abode at* Antioch *seven years before his coming thither*; (which yet all the Witnesses agree in) *but that his* Antiochian *Chair fell out at some other time. Wherefore I thus order the whole matter from the Testimony of most Ancient Authors,* (not that any one before him ever wrote any such thing, but this he supposeth may be said to reconcile their Contradictions), *In the second year of* Claudius *He came to* Rome. *From thence unto his death were 25 years*

more

more or less: which space of time although the Ancients write that he sate at Rome, *yet it doth not follow thence, that he always abode in the City; for in the 4th year after his coming, he returned unto* Jerusalem *to be present at the Council of the Apostles; thence going unto* Antioch, *he continued there seven years, unto the raign of* Nero. *In the beginning of his raign, he returned unto* Rome, *to repair the decaying Church there; from thence passing almost through all* Europe, *he returned again to* Rome *in the last year of* Nero, *and underwent Martyrdome by the Cross.* You may easily discern the *uncertainty* at least of that Story, which this learned man, can give no countenance unto, but by multiplying improbable *imaginations* to shelter one another. For, 1. Who ever said that *Peter* came from *Rome* to come up to the *Council* at *Hierusalem*; when it is most manifest from the *Story* of the *Acts* that he had never before departed out of *Judea*; and this *Council* being granted to have been in the 6th year of *Claudius*, as here it is by *Onuphrius*, quite overthrows the *Tradition* of his going to *Rome* in his second. 2. The abode of 25 years at *Rome*, as thus disposed, is no abode indeed; for he continued almost twice as long at *Antioch* as he did at *Rome*. 3. Here is no time at all allowed unto him for preaching the Gospel in *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, and *Bythinia*, which certainly are not Provinces of *Europe*, in which places *Eusebius*, *Hist. Lib.* 3. *cap.* 1. *Origen*, and all the Ancients agree that he did attend unto his Apostleship towards the *Jews*; and his *Epistles* make it evident. 4. Nor is there any time left for him to be at *Babylon*, where yet we know he was; so that this fancy can have no countenance given it, without a full rejection of all that we know to be true in the Story.

4. The

4. The Scripture is utterly silent of any such thing as *Peters* going to *Rome*. Other journeyings of his it records, as to *Samaria*, *Lydda*, *Joppa*, *Cæsaria*, *Antioch*. Now it was no way materiall that his coming unto any of these places should be known, but only in reference unto the things *done* there by him; and yet they are recorded. But this his going to *Rome*, which is supposed to be of such huge importance in Christian Religion, and that according to *Onuphrius* falling out in the middest of his other journeyings, as it must do if ever it fell out, is utterly passed by in silence. If it had been to have such *an influence* into the very being of Christianity as now is pretended, some men will be apt to think, that the *mention* of it would not have been omitted. 5. *Paul* in his Epistle to the *Romans*, written a good while after this imaginary going *of Peter* to *Rome*, makes no mention of him, when yet he saluted by name those of *chief note* and dignity in the Church there. So that undoubtedly he was not then come thither. 6. The same Apostle being at *Rome*, in the reign of *Nero*, in the amidst of the time allotted unto the abode of *Peter* there, never once mentions him in any of the *Epistles* which from thence he wrote unto the Churches and his fellow labourers; though he doth remember very many *others* that were with him in the City. 7. He asserts that in one of his *Epistles* from thence, which as I think sufficiently proves that *Peter* was not then there; for he saies plainly *that in his triall he was forsaken by all men*, that *no man stood by him*, which he mentions as their sin, and prays for pardon for them. Now no man can reasonably think, that *Peter* was amongst the number of them whom he complained of. 8. The Story is not consistent with what is expressly written

ten of *Peter* by *Luke* in the *Acts*, and *Paul* in his Epistle to the *Galatians*. *Paul* was converted unto the faith about the 38th year of Christ, or 5th after his Ascension. After this he continued 3 years preaching the Gospel about *Damascus*, and in *Arabia*. In the 40th or 41st year of Christ he came to *Jerusalem*, to conferr with *Peter*, Gal. 1. which was the first of *Claudius*. As yet therefore, *Peter* was not removed out of *Judaa*: 14 *years* after, that is, either *after* his first going up to *Jerusalem*, or rather 14 years *after* his first Conversion, he went up again to *Jerusalem*, and found *Peter* still there, which was in the 52d year of Christ, and the 13th of *Claudius*. Or if you should take the date of the 14 *years* mentioned by him shorter by 5 or 6 years, and reckon their beginning from the passion and *Resurrection* of Christ, which is not improbable; then this going up of *Paul* to *Hierusalem*, will be found to be the same with his going up to the *Councel* from *Antioch*, about the 6th or rather 7th year of *Claudius*. *Peter* was then yet certainly at *Hierusalem*. That is, about the 46th year of Christ; some while after you would have the Church to be founded by him at *Rome*. After this, when *Paul* had taken a long progress through many Countreys, wherein he must needs spend some years, returning unto *Antioch*, Act. 18. 22. he there again met with *Peter*, Gal. 2. 11. *Peter* being yet still in the *East* towards the end of the Raign of *Claudius*. At *Antioch* where *Paul* found him, if any of your *Witnesses* may be believed, he abode 7 years. Besides he was now very old, and *ready to lay down his mortality, as our Lord had forwed him*; and in all probability after his remove from *Antioch*, spent the residue of his dayes in the *Eastern* Dispersion of the *Jews*. For, 9ly, much of the Apostles work in *Pa-*

lestine

Iestine among the *Jews* was now drawing to an end; the elect being gathered in, troubles were growing upon the Nation; and *Peter* had, as we observed before, agreed with *Paul* to take the Care of the *Circumcision*, of whom the greatest number by far, excepting only *Judea* its self, was in *Babylon* and the *Eastern Nations* about it. Now whether these and the like observations out of the *Scripture* concerning the Course of St *Peters* life, be not sufficient to outballance the *Testimony* of your *disagreeing* Witnesses, impartial and unprejudiced men may judge. For my part, I do not intend to conclude peremptorily from them, that *Peter* was never at *Rome*, or never preached the Gospel there; but that your Assertion of it is *improbable*, and built upon very Questionable grounds, that I suppose I may safely conclude. And God forbid, that we should once imagine the present *faith* of Christians, or their Profession of Christian Religion, to be built upon such *uncertain Conjectures*, or to be concerned in them whether they be true, or false. Nothing can be spoken with more *reproach* unto it, than to say, that it stands in need of such supportment. And yet if this one *Supposition* fail you, all your *building* falls to the ground in a moment. Never was so stupendous a *fabrick* raised on such imaginary *foundations*. But that we may proceed; Let us suppose this also, that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and preached the Gospel there, What will thence follow unto your advantage? what, towards the settlement of any man in Religion, or bringing us unto the Unity of faith, the things enquired after? He was at, he preached the Gospel at *Hierusalem*, *Samaria*, *Joppa*, *Antioch*, *Babylon*, and sundry other places, and yet we find no such Consequences pleaded from thence, as you urge from his

Coming

Coming to *Rome*. Wherefore you adde,

V. *That St Peter was Bishop of the Roman Church; that he fixed his seat there, and there he died.*

In gathering up your Principles I follow the footsteps of *Bellarmine*, *Baronius*, and other great Champions of your Church; so that you cannot except against the *method* of our proposals of them. Now this *Conclusion* is built on these three Suppositions. 1. That *Peter* had an *Episcopal Office* distinct from his *Apostolical*; 2. That he was at *Rome*; 3. That he fixed his *Episcopal Sea* there; whereof the *Second* is very Questionable, the *First* and *Last* are absolutely false. So that the *Conclusion* its self must needs be a notable fundamentall *Principle* of Faith. It is true, and I shewed it before, that the Apostles when they came into any Church did exercise all the *Power* of Bishops in and over that Church, but not *as* Bishops but as Apostles. As a King may in many of the Cities of his dominions where he comes, exercise all the Authority of the *Mayor*, or particular Governour of that place where he is, which yet doth not make him become the *Mayor* of the place; which would be a diminution of his royall Dignity. No more did the Apostles become *Local Bishops*, because of their exercising *Episcopal* Power in any particular Church, by virtue of their Authority Apostolical, wherein that other was included, as hath been declared. And *Cui Bono?* to what purpose serves this *fictitious Episcopacy?* All the *Priviledges* that you contend for the Assignation of unto *Peter*, were bestowed upon him as an Apostle, or as a believing disciple of Christ. As such he had those peculiar grants made unto him. The *Keys* of the Kingdome of heaven were given unto him as an Apostle (or, according to St *Austin*, as a *believer*) as such

such was he commanded to *feed the sheep* of Christ. It was unto him as an Apostle, or a professing believer, that Christ promised to *build the Church*, on the faith that he had professed. You reckon all these things among the priviledges of *Peter* the Apostle, who as *such* is said to be ὁ πρῶτος, or *first* in order. As an Apostle he had the *Care of all Churches committed unto him*; As an Apostle he was *divinely inspired* and enabled infallibly to reveal the mind of Christ. All these things belonged unto him *as an Apostle*; and what Priviledge he could have besides *as a Bishop* neither you nor I can tell; no more than you can *when*, *how*, or by *whom* he was called and ordained unto any such office; all which we know well enough concerning his Apostleship. If you will then have any to succeed him in the enjoyment of any, or of all these *Privileges*, you must bespeak him to succeed him in his *Apostleship*, and not in his *Bishoprick*. Besides, as I said before, this *imaginary Episcopacy* which limits and confines him unto a particular Church, as it doth if it be an *Episcopacy* properly so called, is destructive of his *Apostolical* Office, and of his Duty in answering the Commission given him of preaching the Gospel to *every Creature*, following the Guidance of Gods Providence, and *conduct* of the Holy Ghost in his way. Many of the Ancients I confess affirm that *Peter* late *Bishop* of the Church of *Rome*; but they all evidently use the word in a *large sense* to imply that during his abode there, (for that there he was, they did suppose,) he took upon him the *especial Care* of that Church. For the same Persons constantly affirm that *Paul* also was *Bishop* of the same Church, at the same time; which cannot be otherwise understood than in the large sense mentioned. And *Ruffinus*, *Præfat. Recog. Clementi. ad Gaudent.* unriddles the mystery: *Linus*, saith he,

be, & Clatus fuerunt ante Clementem Episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superstite Petro; videlicet, ut illi Episcopatus Curam gererent, ipse verò Apostolatus impleret officium. Linus and Cletus were Bishops in the City of Rome before Clemens, but whilest Peter was yet alive; they performing the Duty of Bishops, Peter attending unto his office Apostolical. And hereby doth he utterly discard the present new plea of the foundation of your faith. For though he assert that Peter the Apostle was at Rome, yet he denies that he ever sate Bishop there, but names two others that ruled that Church at Rome joyntly during his time, either in one Assembly, or in two, the one of the Circumcision, the other of the Gentile-Converts. And if Peter were thus Bishop of Rome, and entred as you say upon his Episcopacy at his first coming thither, whence is it that you are forced to confess that he was so long absent from his charge? Five years, saith Bellarmine, but that will by no means salve the Difficulty. Seven saith Onuphrius, at once, and abiding at one place; the most part of his time besides being spent in other places, and yet allowing him no time at all for those places where he certainly was: Eighteen, saith Cortesius; strange that he should be so long absent from his especiall Cure, and never write one word to them, for their instruction or consolation; whereas in the mean time he wrote two Epistles unto them, who it seems did not in any speciall manner belong unto his Charge: I wish we could once find our way out of this maze of uncertainties. This is but a sad disquisition after Principles of faith, to settle men in Religion by them; And yet if we should suppose this also, wee are farre enough from our journeys end. The present Bishop of Rome is as yet behind the curtain, neither can he appear upon the stage, untill he be ushered in by one pretence more

of

of the same nature with them that went before. And this is,

V. *That some one must needs succeed* Peter *in his Episcopacy*: But why so? why was it not needfull that one should succeed him in his *Apostleship*? Why was it not needfull that *Paul* should have a successor as well as *Peter*? and *John* as well as either of them? Because, you say, *that was necessary* for the Church, not so *these*. But who *told* you so? where is the *proof* of what you averre? who made you *judges* of what is *necessary*, and what is *not* necessary for the Church of Christ, when himself is silent? And why is not the *succession of an Apostle* necessary as well as of such a *Bishop* as you fancie? had it not been better to have had one still residing in the Church, of whose *Infallibility* there could have been no doubt or question? One that had the power of *working Miracles*, that should have no need to scare the people by *shaking fire* out of his sleeve, as your Pope *Gregory* the 7th was wont to do, if *Cardinall Benno* may be believed. But you have now carried us quite off from the *Scripture*, and *Story*, and probable conjectures, to attend unto you whilest you give the Lord Jesus *prudentiall advice*, about what is necessary for his Church; It must *needs* be so, it is *meet* it should be so, is the best of your proof in this matter: Only your *fratres Walenburgici* adde, *that never any man ordained the Government of a Community more weakly, than Christ must be supposed to have done the Government of his Church, if he have not appointed such a Successour to* Peter *as you imagin*. But it is easie for you to *affirm* what you please of this nature, and as easie for any one to *reject* what you so affirm if he please. These things are without the *verge* of Christian Religion; *Chimera's*, Towers and Palaces in the ayr: But what must S[t] *Peter* be succeeded in? his *Episcopacy*;

and what therewithall? his *Authority*, Power and Jurisdiction over all Churches in the world, with an *unerring judgement* in matters of faith. But all these belonged unto *Peter*, as *far* as ever they belonged unto him, as he was an *Apostle*, long before you fancie him to have been a *Bishop*: As then his *Episcopacy* came without these things, so for ought you know, it might goe without it. This is a matter of huge importance in that *Systeme* of Principles, which you tender unto us, to bring us unto settlement in Religion, and the Unity of Faith; would you would consider a little, how you may give some *tolerable appearance* of Proof unto that which the Scripture is so utterly silent in; yea which lyes against the whole *Oeconomy* of the Lord Jesus Christ in his ordering of his Church, as delivered unto us therein; *dic aliquem dic, Quintiliane, colorem.* But we come now to the Pope, whom here we first find *latentem, post Principia*, and coming forth [illegible] with his Claim. For you say.

VI. *That the Bishop of Rome is the man that thus succeeds* Peter *in his Episcopacy, which though it were settled at* Rome, *was over the whole Catholick Church.* So you *say*, and so you profess your selves to *believe*. And we desire that you would not take it amiss if we desire to know upon what *grounds* you do so; being unwilling to cast away all *Consideration* that we may embrace *a fanatical Credo* in this unlikely business. We desire therefore to know, who appointed that there should be any *such* succession; *who*, that the Bishop of *Rome* should be *this* Successor. Did *Jesus Christ* do it? we may justly expect you should say, He did: but if you do, we desire to know *when, where, how*; seeing the Scripture is utterly *silent* of any such thing. Did St *Peter* himself do it? Pray, manifest unto us that by the appointment of *Jesus Christ* he had

power

power so to do; and that secondly he *actually* did so: Neither of these can you prove, or produce any Testimony worth *crediting* in confirmation of it. Did it necessarily follow from hence, because that was the place where *Peter died*: But this was *accidentall*, a thing that *Peter* thought not of: for, you say, that a *few dayes* before his death he was leaving that place. Besides according to this insinuation, why did not every Apostle leave a *Successour* behind him in the place where he *dyed*, and that by vertue of his *dying* in that place? or produce you any *Patent* granted to *Peter* in especiall, that where he *dyed* there he should leave a Successour behind him. But it seems the whole weight of your faith, is layed upon a matter of *fact* accidentally falling out, yea and that very incertain whether ever it fell out or no. Shew us any thing of the *will* and institution of *Christ* in this matter: As, that *Peter* should go to *Rome*, that he should fix his *seat* there, that he should *dye* there, that he should have a *Successour*, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* should be his Successour, that unto this Successour I know not what, nor how many *Priviledges* should be conveyed: All these are *arbitrary inventa*, Inventions that men may multiply *in infinitum* at their pleasure: For what should set bounds to the imaginations of men, when once they cast off *all Reverence* of Christ and his Truth? Once more; Why did not *Peter* fix a Seat and leave a Successor at *Antioch*, and in other places, where he abode, and preached, and exercised *Episcopal Power* without all question? Was it because *he dyed at* Rome? This is to acknowledg that the whole Papacy is built, as was said, upon an accidentall matter of fact; and that supposed not proved. Further, If he must be supposed to *succeed upon*, I desire to know *what* that succession is, and *wherein* he doth succeed him: Doth he succeed him

in *all that he had and was*, in reference unto the Church of God? Doth he succeed him in *the manner of his Call* to his Office? *Peter* was called immediately by *Christ* in his own Person: the *Pope* is chosen by the *Conclave of Cardinals*, concerning *whom*, their Office, Priviledges, Power, Right to choose the Successour of *Peter*, there is not one *iota* in the Scripture, or any Monuments of the best Antiquity: and how in their *Election* of Popes they have been influenced by the interest of powerfull *Strumpets*, your own *Baronius* will inform you. Doth he succeed him in the *way and manner* of his Personal *Discharge* of his Office and imployment? Not in the least; *Peter* in the pursuit of his Commission and in obedience unto the command of his *Lord and Master*, travailed up and down the world, preaching the Gospel, *planting* and *watering* the Churches of Christ, in patience, self-deniall, humility, zeal, temperance, meekness. The *Pope* raigns at *Rome* in ease, exalting himself above the Kings of the earth, without taking the least *pains* in his own Person for the conversion of Sinners, or edification of the Disciples of Christ. Doth he succeed him in his *Personal Qualifications* which were of such extraordinary advantage unto the Church of God in his dayes, his Faith, Love, Holiness, Light and Knowledg, you will not say so. Many of your *Popes* by your own confession, have been *ignorant* and stupid, many of them *flagitiously wicked*, to say no more. Doth he succeed him in the *way and manner* of his exercising his Care and Authority towards the Churches of Christ? as little as the rest: *Peter* did it by his *prayers* for the Churches, personal visitation, and instruction of them, writing by inspiration for their direction and guidance according to the will of God: The *Pope* by *Bulls*, and *Consistorial Determinations*, executed by intricate

Legal

Legal Processe, and Officers unknown not only to *Peter* but all Antiquity, whose ways, practices, orders, terms, S. *Peter* himself were he upon the earth again would very little understand. Doth he succeed him in his *Personal Infallibility*? agree among your selves if you *can*, and give an answer unto this inquiry. Doth he succeed him in his *power of working Miracles*? you do not so much as pretend thereunto. Doth he succeed him in the *Doctrine* that he taught? it hath been proved unto you *a thousand times*, that he doth not; and wee are still ready to prove it again if you call us thereunto. Wherein then doth this *Succession* consist that you talk of? In his *Power, Authority, Jurisdiction, Supremacy, Monarchy*, with the Secular Advantages of Riches, Honour, and Pomp that attend them; things sweet and desireable unto *carnall* mindes: This is the *Succession* you pretend to plead for: And are you not therein to be *commended* for your wisdome? In the things that *Peter* really enjoyed, and which were of *singular* Spiritual advantage unto the Church of God, you disclaim any Succession unto him; and fix it on things wherein he was no way *concerned*, that make for your own *Secular* advantage and interest. You have certainly layed your *design* very well if these things would *hold good* to Eternity. For, hence it is that you draw out the *Monarchy* of your *Pope*, *direct* and absolute in *Ecclesiasticall* things over the whole Church; *in direct* at least, and in *ordine ad Spiritualia*, over the whole world. This is the *Diana* in making of *Shrines* for whom your occupation consists, and it brings no *small gains* unto you. Hence you wire-draw his *Cathedrall Infallibility*, Legislative Authority, Freedom from the *judgment* of any, whereby you hope to secure him and your selves from all *opposition*, endeavouring to terrifie them with this *Medusa*'s head that

approach unto you. Hence are his *Titles*: *The Vicar of Christ*, *Head and Spouse of his Church*, *Vice-Deus*, *Deus alter in Terris*, and the like, whereby you keep up *popular veneration*, and preserve his *Majestick* distance from the poor Disciples of Christ. Hence you warrant his *practices* suited unto these pretensions and Titles, in the *deposing* of Kings, *transposing* of Titles unto Dominion and Rule, *giving away* of Kingdoms, stirring up and waging *mighty warres*, causing and commanding them that *dissent* from him, or refuse to yield obedience unto him, to be *destroyed* with fire and sword. And who can now question but that you have very *wisely* stated your Succession.

This is the *way*, this the *progress*, whereby you pretend to bring us unto the *Unity of faith*. If we will submit unto the *Pope*, and acquiesce in his Determinations, (whereunto to induce us we have the Cogent Reasons now considered,) the work will be effected. This is the way that God hath, as you pretend, *appointed* to bring us unto Settlement in Religion. These things you have told us so *often*, and with so much Confidence, that you take it ill we should question the truth of any *thing* you averr in the whole matter; and look upon us as very *ignorant* or *unreasonable* for our so doing. Yea he that believes it safer for him to trust the *everlasting concernments* of his soul unto the Goodness, Grace, and Faithfulness of God in his Word, than unto these *Principles* of yours, is rejected by you out of the limits of the *Catholick Church*, that is, of Christianity; for they are the same. To make good your judgement and censure then, you vent *endless Cavils* against the Authority, Perfection, and Perspicuity of the Scriptures, pretending to despise and scorn whatever is offered in their vindication. This *rope of Sand*, composed of *false suppositions*, groundless *presumptions*, inconsequent

quent *inferences*, in all which there is not one word of *infallible* Truth, at least that you can any way make *appear* so to be, is the great Bond you use to *gird* men withall into the Unity of Faith. In brief, you tell us, that if wee will all *submit to the Pope*, wee shall be sure all to agree. But this is no more, but, as I have before told you, what every *party of men* in the world tender us upon the same or the like condition. It is not a *mere agreement* wee aym at, but an agreement in the Truth, not a *meer Unity*, but a Unity of *Faith*, and Faith must be built on Principles *infallible*, or it will prove in the close to have been *fancy* not Faith, carnall *imagination*, not Christian belief: otherwise wee may agree in *Turcism*, or *Judaism*, or *Paganism*, as well as in Christianity, and to as good purpose. Now what of this *kind* do you tender unto us? Would you have us to leave the sure word of *Prophesie*, more sure than a voyce from Heaven, the *Light* shining in the dark places of this world which wee are commanded to attend unto by God himself, the *Holy Scripture* given by Inspiration, which *is able to make us wise unto Salvation*, the Word that is *perfect*, *sure*, right, converting the Soul, *enlightning the eyes*, *making wise the simple*, whose observation is attended with great reward, to *give heed*, yea to give up all our Spirituall and eternall concernments, to the *credit* of old groundless uncertain Stories, inevident *presumptions*, fables invented for and openly improved unto *carnal*, secular, and wicked ends? Is your request reasonable? Would wee could prevail with you to cease your *importunity* in this matter: especially considering the dangerous *consequence* of the admission of these your Principles unto Christianity in generall. For, if it be so that St *Peter* had such an *Episcopacy* as you talk of, and that a continuance of it in a Succession by the

Bishops

Bishops of *Rome*, be of that indispensable *necessity* unto the preservation of Christian Religion as is pretended, many men considering the *nature* and *quality* of that Succession, how the *means* of its continuation have been *arbitrarily* and occasionally changed, what place formerly *popular Suffrage*, and the *Imperial Authority* have had in it; how it came to be devolved on a *Conclave of Cardinals*, what *violence* and *tumults* have attended *one* way, what *briberies* and filthy respects unto the lusts of unclean Persons the other, what *Interruptions* the Succession it self hath had by *vacancies*, Schisms, and contests for the place, and *uncertainty* of the Person that had the best right unto the *Popedome* according to the customes of the dayes wherein he lived, and that many of the *Persons* who have had a *place* in the pretended Succession, have been plainly *men of the world*, such as cannot receive the Spirit of Christ, yea *open enemies* unto his Cross: would find just cause to suspect that Christianity were *utterly failed* many Ages ago in the world, which certainly would not much promote the *Settlement* in Truth and Unity of Faith that we are enquiring after. And this is the *First way* that you propose to supply that *Defect* which you charge upon the Scripture, that it is *insufficient* to reconcile men that are at variance about Religion, and *settle* them in the Truth. And if you are able by so many *uncertainties* and untruths to bring men unto a Certainty and *Settlement* in the Truth, you need not despair of compassing any thing, that you shall have a mind to attempt.

But you have yet *another Plea* which you make no less use of than of the former, which must therefore be also, (now you have engaged us in this work,) a little examined: This is the *Church*, its Authority and *Infallibility*. The truth is, when you come to

make

make a *practical Application* of this Plea unto your own uſe, you *reſolve* it into, and confound it with that foregoing of the *Pope*, in whom ſolely many of you would have this *Authority* and *Infallibility* of the Church to reſide. Yet becauſe in your mannagement of it, you proceed on other Principles than thoſe before mentioned, this *pretence* alſo ſhall be apart conſidered. And here you tell us,

1. *That the Church was before the Scripture, and giveth Authority unto it.* By the Scriptures you know that wee underſtand *the Word of God*, with this *one Adjunct* of its being written by his command and appointment. We do not ſay that it belongs unto the *Eſſence* of the Word of God that it be written: Whatever is *ſpoken* by God, wee admit as his Word, when wee are *infallibly* aſſured that by Him it was ſpoken, and that wee ſhould do ſo *before*, himſelf doth not require at our hands: for he would have us uſe our *utmoſt diligence* not to be *impoſed upon* by any in his Name. Therefore wee grant that the *Word of God* was given out for the Rule of men in his Worſhip, *two thouſand years* before it was written; but it was *ſo given forth*, as that they unto whom it *came*, had *infallible* aſſurance that from Him it came and his Word it was: And if you, or any man elſe, can give us *ſuch aſſurance*, that any thing is, or hath been ſpoken by him, beſides what we have *now written* in the Scripture, wee ſhall receive it with the ſame *faith* and obedience, wherewith wee receive the Scripture it ſelf. Whereas therefore you ſay, *That the Church was before the Scripture*, if you intend no more but that there *was a Church in the World*, before the *Word of God was written*, wee grant it true; but not at all to your purpoſe. If you intend that the *Church is before the Word of God*, which at an appointed time *was written*, it may poſſibly be wreſted unto your

purpoſe,

purpose, but is farre from being true; seeing the Church is a *society of men, called to the knowledg and worship of God by his Word.* They become a Church by the *call of that Word*, which it seems you would have not given untill they are a Church: so *Effects* produce their Causes, *Children* beget their Parents, *Light* brings forth the Sunne, and *Heat* the Fire: So are the *Prophets* and Apostles built upon the foundation of the Church, whereof the *Pope* is the *Corner stone:* So was the *Judaical* Church before the *Law* of its constitution, and the *Christian* before the Word of *Promise* whereon it was founded, and the Word of *Command* by which it was edified. In brief, from the day wherein Man was first *created* upon the earth, to the *days* wherein we live, never did a Person or Church yield any *obedience*, or perform any *acceptable worship* unto God, but what was founded on, and *regulated* by his Word, given unto them *antecedently* unto their obedience and worship, to be the *sole* foundation and Rule of it. That you have no concernment in what *is*, or *may* be *truly* spoken of the Church, we shall afterwards shew; but it is not for the *interest of Truth*, that wee should suffer you without *controul*, to impose such *absurd notions* on the minds of men; especially when you pretend to direct them unto a *Settlement* in Religion. Alike true is it, that the *Church gives Authority unto the Scripture:* Every true Church indeed *gives witness or Testimony* unto it, and it is its Duty so to do; it *holds it forth*, declares, and manifests it, so that it may be *considered* and taken notice of by all; which is one main End of the *Institution* of the Church in this world: But the Church no more *gives Authority* to the Scripture than it gives Authority to *God* himself: He requires of men the discharge of that *Duty* which he hath assigned unto them, but stands not in need of their

suffrage

suffrage to confirm his Authority. It was not so indeed with the *Idols* of old, of whom *Tertullian* said rightly, *Si Deus homini non placuerit, Deus non erit*: The reputation of their Deity depended on the Testimony of men; as, *you say*, that of *Christ's* doth on the *Authority* of the Pope. But I shall not farther insist upon the *disproovement* of this vanity; having shewed already, that the Scripture hath *all its Authority* both in its self, and in reference unto us, from *Him* whose Word it is: and wee have also made it appear, that your *Assertions* to the contrary, are meet for nothing but to open a door unto all *Irreligiousness*, Prophaneness, and Atheism; so that there is οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς, *nothing sound or savoury*, nothing which an heart carefull to preserve its Loyalty unto God, will not *nauseate* at, nothing not suited to oppugn the fundamentals of Christian Religion in this your *Position*. This ground well fixed you tell us,

II. *That the Church is infallible, or cannot erre in what she teacheth to be believed.* And we ask you what *Church* you mean, and how far you intend that it is *infallible*? The only *known Church* which was then in the world, was in the *Wilderness* when *Moses* was in the mount. Was it *infallible* when it made the *golden Calf*, and danced about it proclaiming a feast unto *Jehovah* before the Calf? was the same Church afterward *Infallible* in the dayes of the Judges, when it worshipped *Baalim* and *Astaroth*? or in the dayes of *Jeroboam*, when it sacrificed before the *Calves at Dan and Bethel*? or in the other branch of it in the dayes of *Ahaz*, when the *High-Priest* set up an *Altar* in the *Temple* for the King to offer Sacrifice unto the *gods of Damascus*? or in the dayes of *Jehoiakim* and *Zedekiah*, when the High-Priest with the rest of the Priests, *imprisoned* and would have slain *Jeremiah* for preaching the word of

God? or when they preferred the *worship of the Queen of Heaven* before that of the God of *Abraham*? Or was it *infallible* when the High-Priest, with the whole *Councel* or *Sanedrim* of the Church, *judicially* condemned as far as in them lay their own *Messias*, and rejected the Gospel that was preached unto them? You must inform us what *other Church* was then in the world, or you will quickly perceive how ungrounded your *generall Maxim* is, of the Churches *absolute infallibility*. As farre indeed as it attends unto the *Infallible Rule* given unto it, it is so; but not one jot farther. Moreover, we desire to know, *What Church* you mean in your *Assertion*, or rather what is it that you mean by the Church? Do you intend the *Mystical* Church, or the whole number of *Gods Elect* in all Ages, or in any Age, *militant* on the Earth, which principally is the Church of God, Ephes. 5. 26? Or, do you intend the whole *diffused body* of the Disciples of Christ in the world, separated to God by *Baptism* and the Profession of saving truth, which is the *Church Catholick visible*; Or, do you mean any *particular Church* as the *Roman*, or *Constantinopolitan*, the *French*, *Dutch*, or *English* Church? If you intend the *first* of These, or the Church in the *first sense*; we acknowledge that it is thus far *infallible*, that no true member of it shall ever *totally* and *finally* renounce, lose, or forsake that faith, without which they cannot *please God* and be saved. This the Scripture teacheth, this *Austin* confirmeth in an *hundred places*. If you intend the Church in the *second sense*; we grant that also so far unerring and *infallible*, as that there ever *was*, and ever *shall* be in the world, a number of men making Profession of the *saving Truth* of the Gospel, and yielding professed subjection unto our Lord Jesus Christ according unto

it,

it, wherein consists his *visible Kingdome* in this world; that never was, that never can be *utterly* overthrown. If you speak of a Church in the *last sense*, then we tell you, That no *such Church* is by vertue of any *Promise* of our Lord Jesus Christ, freed from *erring*, yea so farre as to deny the *fundamentals* of Christianity, and thereby to lose the very *being* of a Church. Whilst it continues a Church, it cannot *erre fundamentally*; because such Errours destroy the very *being* of a Church; but those who were *once a Church*, by their failing in the Truth, may cease to be *so* any longer: And a Church *as such* may so *fail*, though every *Person* in it do not so; for the *individual members* of it, that are so also of the *Mysticall Church*, shall be preserved in its *Apostasie*. And so the *Mysticall* Church, and the *Catholick* Church of Professors may be continued, though all *particular* Churches should fail: So that *no Person*, the Church in no sense is *absolutely* freed in this world from the danger of all errours: that is the condition wee shall attain *in Heaven*; here where we know but in part wee are incapable of it. The Church of *the Elect* and every member of it, shall *eventually* be preserved by the power of the *Holy Ghost*, from any such *errour* as would *utterly* destroy their Communion with Christ in Grace here, or *prevent* their fruition of him in Glory hereafter: or, as the Apostle speaks, they shall assuredly be *kept by the Power of God through faith unto salvation*. The Generall Church of *Visible Professors*, shall be always *so farre* preserved in the world, as that there shall never *want* some, in some place or other of it, that shall profess all *needfull saving Truths* of the Gospel, in the belief whereof and *obedience* whereunto a man may be saved. But for *Particular Churches* as such, they have no *security* but what lyes in their diligent attendance

unto

unto that *Infallible Rule*, which will preserve them from all hurtfull Errours, if through their *own default* they neglect not to keep close unto it. And your *flattering your selves* with an imagination of any other Priviledge, is that which hath wrought your ruine: You are deceived if in this matter you are of *Menander's* mind, who sayed ἀντίμαλα τὰ πράγματ' ἐστὶ τῷ συμφέροντι βίῳ, κἂν ῥᾳθυμῇς; that, all will of its *own accord* fall out well with you though *you sleep* securely. As for *all other Churches* in the world besides your own, wee have your *confession* not only that they were and are *fallible*, but that they have *actually erred* long since: and the same hath been proved against yours *a thousand times*; and your best Reserve against particular charges of Errour lyes in this *impertinent* generall pretence, that you cannot erre. It may be you will ask, for you use so to do, and it is the design of your *Fiat* to promote the Inquiry, If the Church be *fallible*, that is to propose unto us the *things* and *Doctrines* that we are to believe, How can we with faith *infallible* believe her proposals? And I tell you truly *I know not* how we can, if we believe them only upon *her Authority*, or she propose them to be believed *solely* upon that account; but when she *proposeth* them unto us to be believed on the *Authority of God* speaking in the Scriptures, we both can, and do believe what she teacheth and *proposeth*, and that with faith *infallible* resolved into the Veracity of God in his Word: and we grant *every Church* to be so farre *infallible* as it attends unto the only *Infallible Rule* amongst men: When you prove that *any one Church* is by any promise of Christ, any grant of Priviledge expressed or intimated in the Scripture, placed in an *unerring condition*, any farther than as in the *use of the means* appointed she attends unto the *only Rule* of her preservation, or that any Church shall be *necessitated*

to

to attend unto that Rule whether she will or no, whereby she may be preserved, or can give us an *instance* of any Church since the foundation of the world, that hath been *actually preserved* and absolutely from all errour, (other than that of your own, which you know we cannot admit of,) as you will do, μέγα καὶ πρεσβὺ τὸν ἔργον, *a great and memorable work*, so we shall grant as much as you can reasonably desire of us upon the account of the *Assertion* under consideration. But untill you do some *one*, or all of these, your crying out, *The Church, the Church the Church cannot erre*, makes no other noyse in our ears, than that of the Jews, *The Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Law shall not fail*, did in the ears of the Prophets of old. Neither do we speak this of *the Church*, or any Church, as though we were concerned to question or deny any *just Priviledges* belonging unto it, thereby to *secure* our selves from any pretensions of yours; but meerly for the *sake of Truth*. For we shall manifest anon unto you, that you are *as little concerned* in the Priviledges of the Church, be they what they will, *more* or less, as any Society of the Professours of Christianity in the world; if so be that you are concerned in them at all. So that if the Truth would *permit* us to agree with you in all things that you assign unto *the Church*, yet the *difference* between you and us were never the nearer to an end; for we should still *differ* with you about your share and interest therein; and for ever abhor your frowardness in *appropriating* of them all unto your selves: And herein, as I sayed, hath lyen a great *part* of your ruine; Whilest you have been *sweetly dreaming* of an *Infallibility*, you have really plunged your selves into errours innumerable: and when any one hath *jogged* you to awake you out of your *fatall sleep*, by minding you of your particular

errours, your dream hath left such an *impression* upon your imagination, as that you think them *no errours*, upon this only ground, because *you cannot erre*. I am perswaded, had it not been for this *one errour*, you had been freed from many others: But this perfectly *disinables* you for any candid Inquisition after the Truth: For why should he once *look about* him, or indeed so much as take care to keep his *eyes open*, who is sure that he can never be out of his way. Hence you inquire not at all, whether what you profess be *Truth* or not, but to *learn* what your Church teacheth and defend it, is all that you have to do about Religion in this world: And whatever *Absurdities* or Inconveniencies you find your selves driven unto in the handling of *particular points*, all is one, they must be right though you cannot defend them, because your Church which *cannot erre* hath so declared them to be: And if you should chance to be convinced of any Truth in particular that is contrary to the *determination* of your Church, you know not how to embrace it, but must shut your eyes against its *light* and evidence, and cast it out of your minds, or *wander* up and down with a various assent between Contradictions. Well said he of old

> Ἐυήθειά μοι φαίνεται δηλαιήνη
> Τὸ νοεῖν μὲν ὅσα δεῖ, μὴ φυλάττεσθαι δ' ἃ δεῖ.

This is *flat folly*, namely for a man to *live in rebellion* unto his own light: But you adde,

III. *That your selves, that is, the Pope with those who in matters of Religion adhere unto him, and live in subjection unto him, are this Church; in an assent unto whose infallible teachings and Determinations, the Unity of Faith doth consist.* Could you *prove* this Assertion I confess it would stand you in good stead. But before we enquire after *that*, we shall endeavour a little to come unto a right understanding of *what* you say.

When

When you affirm that the *Roman Church*, is the Church of Christ, you intend either that it is *the only* Church of Christ, *all* the Church of Christ, and so consequently the *Catholick* Church; or you mean that it is *a Church of Christ*, which hath an especiall *Prerogative* enabling it to require obedience of all the Disciples of Christ. If you say the *former*, we desire to know (1.) *when* it became so to be. It was not so when all the Church was together at *Hierusalem*, and no foundation of any Church at all laid at *Rome*, Acts 1. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. It was not so when the first Church of the *Gentiles* was gathered at *Antioch*, and the Disciples first began to be called Christians; for as yet we have no tydings of any Church at *Rome*. It was not so, when *Paul* wrote his Epistles, for he makes expres mention of many other Churches in other places, which had no relation unto any Church at *Rome*, more than they had one to another in their common Profession of the *same* faith, and therein enjoyed equall gifts and Priviledges with it. It was not so, in the dayes of the *Primitive Fathers* of the first three hundred years, who all of them, not *one* excepted, took the *Roman* to be a *local* particular Church, and the Bishop of *Rome* to be *such* a Bishop, as they esteemed of all other Churches and Bishops: Their perswasion in this matter is expressed in the beginning of the Epistle of *Clement*, or Church of *Rome* unto the Church of *Corinth*, Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, *the Church that is at Rome, to the Church that is at Corinth*; both locall Churches, both equall: And such is the language of all the Writers of those times. It was not so in the dayes of the *Fathers* and *Councels* of the next three *Centuries*, who still accounted it a particular Church, *Diocesan* or *Patriarchal*; but all of them *particular*, never calling it *Catholick*, but upon the account of its holding the *Catholick faith*, as they called

all other Churches that did so, in opposition to the Errours, *Heresies*, and Schisms of any in their dayes. We desire then to know *when* it became the *only* or *absolutely* Catholick Church of Christ: As also (secondly) by *what means* it became so to be? It did not do so by virtue of any *Institution*, Warrant, or Command of Christ: You were never able to produce the least intimation of any such *Warrant* out of any Writing of *Divine Inspiration*, nor approved *Catholick Writer* of the first Ages after Christ, though it hugely concern you so to do, if it were possible to be done; but they all expresly teach that which is *inconsistent* with such pretences. It did not do so, by any *Decree* of the first *Generall Councels*, which are all of them *silent* as to any such thing, and some of them, as those of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, and *Chalcedon*, expresly declare and determine the contrary, at least that which is contrary thereunto. We can find no other way or *means* whereby it can pretend unto this vast Priviledge, unless it be the grant of *Phocas* unto *Boniface*, that he should be called the *Universal Bishop*, who to serve his own ends was very liberal of that which was not at *all* in his power to bestow: And yet neither is this, though it be a *means* that you have more reason to be *ashamed* than to boast of, sufficient to found your present Claim, considering how *that name* was in those dayes no more *than a name*, a meer aery ambitious *Title*, that carried along with it no *reall powr*; and, *stet magni nominis umbra*.

Secondly, We cannot give our assent unto this *Claim* of yours, because we should thereby be necessitated to *cut* off from the Church, and consequently *all hope of salvation*, farre the greatest number of men in the world who in this and all foregoing Ages have called and do *call upon the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, their Lord and ours. This we *dare* not do, especially

cially considering that many of them have *spent* and do *spend* their dayes in great *Affliction* for their Testimony unto Christ and his Gospell, and many of them every day seal their Testimony with *their blood*, so belonging as we believe unto *that holy army of Martyrs*, which continually praiseth God: Now as herein we *dare* not concurre with you considering the charge given unto *Timothy* by *Paul*, μὴ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις, *be not partaker of other mens sins*, so indeed we are perswaded that your *opinion*, or rather *presumption* in this matter, is extreamly injurious to the Grace of Christ, the Love and Goodness of God, as also to the Truth of the Gospell: And therefore

Thirdly, We suppose this the most *Schismaticall* Principle that ever was broached under the Sun, since there was a Church upon the earth: and that because, 1. It is the most *groundless*, 2. The most *uncharitable* that ever was; and 3. Of the most *pernicious* consequence, as having a principal influence into the present *irreconcileableness* of Differences among Christians in the world; which will one day be charged on the *Authors* and Abettors of it; For it will one day appear, that it is not the *various Conceptions* of the minds of peaceable men about the things of God, nor the *various degrees* of knowledge and faith that are found amongst them, but *groundless impositions* of things as *necessary* to be believed and practised, beyond Scripture warrant, that are the Springs and Causes of *all*, or at least the most *blameable* and sinfull differences among Christians.

Fourthly, We know this pretence should it take place, would prove extreamly *hazardous* unto the Truth of the *Promises* of Christ given unto the *Catholick Church*. For, suppose that to be one and the same with the *Roman*, and whatever mishap may befall the *one* must be thought to befall the *other*; for

on your Supposition, they are not only like *Hippocrates* twins, that being born together, wept and joyed together, and together died, but like *Hippocrates* himself, as the same individuall Person or thing, being both the same; *one* Church, that hath *two* names, Catholick and Roman, that is Universall-Particular; no otherwise *two*, than as *Julius Cæsar* was, when by his overawing his Collegue from the execution of his Office, they dated their Acts at *Rome, Julio & Cæsare Consulibus*. For, as they said,

Non Bibulo quicquam nuper sed Cæsare factum est;
Nam Bibulo fieri Consule nil memini.

Now, besides the *failings* which we know your Church to have been subject unto in point of Faith, Manners, and Worship; it hath also been at least in *danger* of Destruction in the time of the prevalency of the *Goths, Vandals, Huns,* and *Longobards*; especially when *Rome* its self was left desolate and without Inhabitant by *Totilas*. And what yet farther may befall it before the End of the world, θεοῦ ἐν γούνασι κεῖται. Only this I know that many are in expectation of a *sad Catastrophe* to be given unto it, and that on grounds not to be despised. Now God forbid, that the Church unto which the *Promises* are made, should be once thought to be subject unto all the dangers and hazards that you *wilfully* expose your selves unto. So that as this is a very groundless *presumption* in its self, so it is a very great aggravation of your miscarriages also, whilest you seek to entitle the *Catholick Church* of Christ unto them, which can neither contract any such guilt as you have done, nor be liable to any such misery or punishment as you are.

Fifthly, We see not the *Promises*, made unto the Catholick Church, *fulfilled* unto you; as we see that to have befallen your Church, which is contrary un-

to

to the Promises that ever it should befall the Catholick. The conclusion then will necessarily on *both instances* follow, that either you are *not the Catholick* Church, or that the *Promises* of Christ have failed and been of none effect. And you may easily guess, which part of the *Conclusion*, it is best and most *safe* for us to give assent unto. I shall give you one or two *instances* unto this last head. Christ hath *promised* his Spirit unto his Church, that is his Catholick Church, to *abide with it for ever*, Joh. 14. 16. But this *Promise* hath not been made good unto your Church at all times; because it hath not been so unto the *head* of it. Many a time the *Head* of your Church hath not *received* the Spirit of Christ; for our Saviour tells us in the next words, that *the world cannot receive him*; that is men of the world, carnally minded men cannot do so: for he is the peculiar *inheritance* of those that are *called, sanctified*, and do *believe*. Now if ever there was *any world* in the world, any of the world in the earth, some, many of your *Popes*, have been so, and therefore by the testimony of Christ could *not receive the Spirit* that he promised unto his Church. Again it is promised, unto the Church *Mysticall* or Catholick in the first and chiefest notion of it, *that all her children shall be holy, all taught of God*, and all *that are so taught*, as our Saviour informs us, *come to him by saving faith*; you will not I am sure for shame affirm that this *Promise* hath been made good to all, either *Children* or *Fathers*, of your Church. Innumerable other *Promises*, made to the Catholick Church, may be instanced in, which you can no better or otherwise apply unto your Church, than one of your *Popes* did that of the *Psalmist* to himself, *Thou shalt tread on the Lion and the Basilisk*, when he set his foot on the neck of *Fredrick* the Emperour. But the Arguments are end-

leſs whereby the vanity of this pretence may be diſproved; I ſhall only adde,

Sixtly, That it is contrary to all *Story*, Reaſon, and common ſenſe: For it is notorious that far the *greateſt part* of Chriſtians, that belong to the Catholick Church of Chriſt, or have done ſo from the dayes that Chriſtianity firſt entred the world ſucceſſively in all Ages, never thought themſelves any otherwiſe concerned in the *Roman Church*, than in any other particular Church of name in the world: And is it not a madneſs to exclude them all from being *Chriſtians*, or belonging to the *Catholick Church*, becauſe they belonged not to the *Roman*: This I could eaſily demonſtrate throughout all *Ages* of the Church ſucceſſively. But we need not inſiſt longer on the diſproving of that *Aſſertion*, which implyes a flat Contradiction in the very terms of it. If any Church be the *Catholick*, it cannot therefore be the *Roman*; and if it be the *Roman* properly, it cannot therefore be the *Catholick*.

2. If you ſhall ſay that you mean only that you are a *Particular Church* of Chriſt, but yet *that*, or *ſuch* a Particular Church, as hath the great *Priviledges* of Infallibility, and *univerſall Authority* annexed unto it, which makes it of neceſſity for all men to ſubmit unto it, and to acquieſce in its Determinations: I anſwer, 1. I fear you will not ſay ſo; you will not, I fear, renounce your claim unto *Catholiciſm*. I have already obſerved that your ſelf in particular affirm the *Roman* and *Catholick* Church to be one and the ſame. It is not enough for you that you belong any way to the Church of Chriſt, but you plead that *none* do ſo but your ſelves. 2. Indeed you do not own your ſelves in this very Aſſertion to be a *Particular Church*; your claim of Univerſall Authority and Juriſdiction, which you ſtill carry along with you, is *inconſiſtent*

conſiſtent with any ſuch conceſſion 3. To make the beſt of it that we can; what ground have you to give us this Difference between the Churches of Chriſt, that one is *fallible*, another *infallible*; that one hath power over all the reſt, that one depends on Chriſt, all the reſt on that one? where is the *leaſt intimation* given of any ſuch thing in the Scripture? where or by whom is it expreſly aſſerted amongſt the *Antient Writers* of the Church? Was this *Principle* pleaded or once aſſerted in any of the Antient *Councels*? Some ambiguous expreſſions of particular Perſons, moſt of them *Biſhops* of *Rome* in the declining days of the Church, you produce indeed unto this purpoſe: But can any rationall man think them a *ſufficient foundation* of that ſtupendious fabrick, which you endeavour to erect upon them? I ſuppoſe you will not find any ſuch Perſons haſty in their ſo doing: Thoſe who are already *engaged* will not be eaſily recovered: For new *Proſelytes* unto theſe Principles you have ſmall ground to expect any, unleſs it be of Perſons whoſe *lives* are either tainted with ſenſuality, which they would gladly have a refuge for againſt the accuſations of their Conſciences, or whoſe *minds* are entangled with worldly ſecular advantages ſuited to their conditions, tempers, and inclinations.

Thus I have, with what *briefneſs* I could, ſhewed you the *uncertainty*, indeed *falſneſs* of thoſe Generall Principles from which you educe all your other *pleas* and reaſonings, into which they muſt be reſolved. And now I pray conſider the *ground-work* you lay for the bringing of men unto a *Settlement* in the Truth and unto the unity of Faith, in oppoſition to the *Scripture* which you reject as inſufficient unto this purpoſe. The ſumme of it is, an *acquieſcency* in the propoſals and Determinations of your Church, as to all things that concern faith and the worſhip of God.

God. The *two main Principles* that concurre unto it, we have apart considered, and have found them every way insufficient for the end proposed. Neither have they one *jot* more of strength, when they are *complicated* and blended together, as they usually are by you, than they have in and of themselves as they stand *singly* on their own bottoms. A thousand *falshoods* put together will be farre enough from making one Truth. A multiplication of them may encrease a *Sophism* but not adde the least weight or strength to an Argument. An army of *Cripples* will not make one sound man. And can you think it reasonable, that we should renounce our *sure and firm Word of Prophecy*, to attend unto you in this chase of uncertain Conjectures, and palpable untruths? Suppose this were a way that would bring you and us to an *Agreement*, and take away the evil of our Differences; I can name you *twenty*, that would do it as effectually; and they should none of them have any *evil* in them, but only that which yours also is openly guilty of; namely the *Relinquishment* of our Duty towards God, and Care of our own Souls, to come to *some peace* amongst our selves in this world, which would be nothing else, but a plain *Conspiracy* against Jesus Christ, and rejection of his *Authority*. At present I shall say no more, but that he who is lead into the *Truth* by *so many Errors*, and is brought unto *establishment* by so many *uncertainties*, hath singular success, and such as no other man hath reason to look for. Or he is like *Robert Duke* of *Normandy* who when he caused the *Saracens* to carry him into *Jerusalem*, sent word unto his friends in *Europe*, that he was *carried into Heaven on the backs of Devils*.

It may also in particular be easily made to appear how *unsuited* your means of bringing men unto the unity of faith, are unto that *Supposition* of the present Differences

Differences in Religion between you and us, which you proceed upon. For, ſuppoſe a man be *convinced* that many things taught by your Church are *falſe*, and contrary to the mind of God, as you know the caſe to be between you and us; what courſe would you take with him to *reduce* him unto the Unity of Faith? would you tell him that your Church *cannot erre*, or would you endeavour to perſwade him that the *particulars* which he inſtanceth in as *Errours*, are not ſo indeed, but real *Truths* and neceſſarily by him to be believed? The former, if you would ſpeak it out, down-right and openly, as becometh men who *diſtruſt* not the Truth of their Principles (for he that is perſwaded of the Truth never fears its ſtrength) would ſoon appear to be a very *wiſe courſe* indeed. You would perſwade a man in generall that you *cannot erre*, whileſt he gives you inſtances that you have *actually erred*. Do not think you have any *Sophiſms* againſt *Motion* in generall, that will prevail with any man to aſſent unto you, whileſt he is able to *riſe and walk* to and fro. Beſides, he that is convinced of any thing wherein you *erre*, believes the *oppoſite* unto it to be true, and that on grounds unto him ſufficiently cogent to require his aſſent: If you could now perſwade him that *you cannot erre*, whileſt he actually believes things to be *true*, which he knows to be contrary to your Determination, what a ſweet condition ſhould you bring him into? can you enable him to believe *Contradictions* at the ſame time? Or, when a man on particular grounds and evidences is come to a *ſetled* firm perſwaſion that any Doctrine of your Church, ſuppoſe that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, is falſe and contradictory unto Scripture and right Reaſon; if you ſhould, abſtracting from particulars, in generall *puzzle* him with *Sophiſms* and pretences for your Churches *Infallibility*, do you think it is an eaſie thing for

for him immediately to forego that perſwaſion in particular, which his mind upon *cogent* and to him unavoidable grounds and arguments was poſſeſſed withall, without a rationall removall of thoſe grounds and Arguments? Mens belief of things never pierces deeper into their Souls than their *imagination*, who can take it up and lay it down at their pleaſure. I am perſwaded therefore, you would take the *latter courſe*, and ſtrive to convince him of his *miſtakes* in the things that he judgeth *erroneous* in the Doctrine of your Church. And what way would you proceed by for his Conviction? Would you not produce *Teſtimonies of Scripture*, with Arguments drawn from them, and the *Suffrage* of the Fathers to the ſame purpoſe? Nay would you not do ſo, if the *errour* he charge you withall, be that of the *Authority* and *Infallibility* of your Church? I am ſure, all your *Controverſie-Writers* of note take this courſe. And do you not ſee then, that you are brought, whether you will or no, unto the uſe of *that way* and means for the reducing of men unto the Unity of Faith, which you before rejected, which *Proteſtants* avow as ſufficient to that purpoſe?

CHAP. IX.

Propoſals from Proteſtant Principles tending unto Moderation and Unity.

YOu may, from what hath been ſpoken, perceive how upon your *own Principles* you are utterly diſenabled to exerciſe any true *moderation* towards Diſſenters from you: And that which you do ſo exerciſe, we are beholding for it, as *Cicero* ſaid of the Honeſty of ſome of the *Epicureans*, to the Goodneſs of their Nature which the illneſs of their Opinions can-

not corrupt. Neither are you any way enabled by them to reduce men *unto the Unity of Faith*; so that, you are not more *happy* in your propoſing of *Good Ends* unto your ſelf, than you are *unhappy* in chuſing *mediums* for the effecting of them. It may be, for your own skill, you are able like *Archimedes* to remove the *earthly-Ball* of our Contentions; but you are like him again, that you have no where to *ſtand* whileſt you go about your work. However we thank you for your Good intentions; *In magnis voluiſſe* is no ſmall commendation. *Proteſtants* on the other ſide, you ſee, are furniſhed with *firm ſtable Principles* and Rules in the purſuit both of *Moderation* and *Unity*: And there are *ſome things* in themſelves very *practicable*, and naturally deducible from the Principles of Proteſtants, wherein the *compleat exerciſe of Moderation* may be obteined, and a better progreſs made towards *Unity* than is likely to be by a rigid contending to impoſe different Principles on one another; or by impetuous clamours of *lo here* and *lo there*, which at preſent moſt men are taken up withall: Some few of them I ſhall name unto you, as a *pacifick Coronis* to the preceding eriſtical Diſcourſe; and

——*Si quid noviſti rectius iſtis*
Candidus imperti; *ſi non, his utere mecum.* And they are theſe:

I. Whereas our Saviour hath determined that our happineſs conſiſteth not in the *knowing* the things of the Goſpell, but in *doing* of them; and ſeeing that no man can expect any *benefit* or advantage from or by Chriſt Jeſus, but *only they* that yeeld *obedience* unto him, to whom alone he is a *Captain of Salvation*; the firſt thing wherein all that profeſs Chriſtianity ought *to agree* and conſent together is, joyntly to *obey* the commands of Chriſt, to *live godlily, righteouſly and ſo-*

berly

berly in this present world, following after holiness without which no man shall see God: Untill we all agree in this, and make it our *business,* and fix it as our *end,* in vain shall we attempt to agree in *notionall* and speculative Truths; nor would it be much to our advantage so to do. For as I remember I have told you before, so I now on this occasion tell you again, It will at the last day appear, that it is all one to any man what *party* of way in Christian Religion he hath been of, if he have not *personally* been *born again,* and upon mixing the *Promises* of Christ with faith, have thereupon *yeilded obedience* unto him unto the end. I confess men may have many *advantages* in one way that they may not have in another: They may have better *means* of instruction, and better *examples* for imitation; But as to the *event,* it will be one and the same with all unbelievers, all unrighteous, and ungodly Persons; And men may be very zealous believers in a *Party,* who are in the sight of God *unbelievers* as to the whole design of the Gospell. This is a Principle wherein as I take it all *Christians agree,* namely that the *Profession* of Christianity will do no man the least Good as to his eternall concernments, that lives not up to the *power* of it; yea it will be an aggravation of his condemnation: And the want hereof, is that which hath lost all the lustre and splendour of the Religion taught by Jesus Christ in the world. Would Christians of all *Parties* make it their business to retrive its reputation, wherein also their own bliss and happiness is involved, by an *universall obedience* unto the precepts of it, it would insensibly sink a *thousand* of their Differences under ground. Were this attended unto, the world would quickly say with admiration

Magnum ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo:
Jam nova progenies Cælo demittitur alto.

The

The old glorious *beautifull* face of Chriſtianity would be reſtored unto it again, which many deform more and more every day by *painting* a dead carcaſs in ſtead of the living Spouſe of Chriſt. And if ever we intend to take *one ſtep* towards any *agreement* or unity, it muſt be by fixing this Principle in the minds of all men, that it is of *no advantage* to any man whatever Church or way in Chriſtian Religion he be of, unleſs he *perſonally believe* the promiſes, and live in obedience unto all the precepts of Chriſt. And that for him who doth ſo, that it is a trampling of the whole Goſpel *under foot* to ſay that his ſalvation could be endangered, by his not being of *this* or that Church or way; eſpecially conſidering how much of the *world* hath immixed its ſelf into all the known wayes that are in it. Were this once well fixed on the minds of men, and did they practically *believe* that men ſhall not be dealt withall at the laſt day by *groſs*, as of this or that party or Church, but that every *Individuall* Perſon muſt ſtand upon his own bottome, *live by his own faith*, or periſh for want of it, as if there had been no other perſons in the world but himſelf; wee ſhould quickly find their *keenneſs* in promoting and contending for their ſeverall parties, taken off, their *heat* allayed, and they will begin to find their buſineſs and concernment in Religion to be utterly another matter than they thought of. For the preſent, ſome Proteſtants think that when the *Roman Power* is by one means or other *broken* which they expect, that then wee ſhall agree and have peace; *Romaniſts* on the other ſide look for, and *deſire* the extirpation of all that they call *Hereſy* or *Hereticks* by one way or other: ſome pretending highly to *Moderation* on both ſides, eſpecially among the *Proteſtants*, hope that it may be attained, by *mutuall condeſcenſion* of the Parties at variance, contemperation of opinions

and

and practiſes unto the preſent diſtant apprehenſions and intereſts of the *chief leaders* of either ſide; what iſſue and event their deſires, hopes, and attempts, will have, *time* will ſhew to all the world. For my part, until by a *freſh powring* out of the Spirit of God from on high, I ſee Chriſtians in *profeſſion*, agreeing in purſuing the end of Chriſtianity, endeavouring to be *followers of Jeſus Chriſt* in a converſation becoming the Goſpell, without truſting to the Parties wherein they are engaged; I ſhall have very little *hopes* to ſee any Unity amongſt us, that ſhall be one *jot* better than our preſent Differences: To ſee this, if any thing, would make me ſay

O mihi tam longè maneat pars ultima vitæ.

The preſent *face* of Chriſtianity makes the world a wearisome wi'derneſs: Nor ſhould I think any thing a more *neceſſary* Duty, than it would be for Perſons of Piety and ability to *apologize* for the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt; and to ſhew how *inconcerned* it is in the wayes and practiſes of the moſt that profeſs it; and how *utterly* another thing it is, from what in the world it is repreſented to be, ſo to put a ſtop unto that *Atheiſm* which is breaking in upon us from the contempt that men have of that *Idea* of Chriſtian Religion which they have taken from the *manner* of its profeſſion, and *lives* of its Profeſſors; were it not that I ſuppoſe it more immediately *incumbent* on them and us all, to do the ſame work in a *reall expreſſion* of its power and excellency, in ſuch a kind of goodneſs, holineſs, righteouſneſs, and heavenlineſs of converſation, as the world is only as yet in ſecret acquainted withall. When this is done, the way for a farther agreement will be *open* and facile; and, untill it be ſo, men will fight on, *Ipſiq; neposq;*

Et nati natorum, & qui naſcentur ab illis.

We

We shall have no end of our Quarrels. Could I see an *Heroick* temper fall on the minds of men of the severall parties at variance, to bid *adieu* to the world, its customs, manners, and fashions, which are all *vain* and perishing, not in a *locall* corporall retirement from the men and lawfull businesses of it, or a *relinquishment* of the necessary callings and employments in it, but in *their spirits & affections*; could I see them taking up the *Cross* of Christ, not on their backs in its *figure*, but on their hearts in its *power*, and in their whole conversation conforming themselves unto his blessed example, so teaching all others of their *parties* what it is that they build upon for a blessed Eternity, that they may not please and deceive *themselves* with their conceited *Orthodoxie* in the trifling Differences which they have with other Christians, I should hope the very name of *persecution* and every thing that is contrary to Christian *Moderation* would quickly be driven out of Christendome, and that *errour*, and what ever is contrary to the *Unity of Faith*, would not be long lived after them. But whileſt these things are *farre from us*, let us not flatter our selves, as though a *windy flourish of words* had any efficacy in it to bring us to *Moderation* and unity. At variance we are, and at variance we must be content to be; that being but one of the *Evils* that at this day triumph in the world over conquered Christianity. This being supposed.

11. Whereas the Doctrine of God is a *Mystery*, in the knowledge whereof men attain unto *Wisedome*, according to that measure of light and Grace, which the *Spirit who devides unto every man as he will* is pleased to communicate unto them, if men would not frame any other *Rule* or standard unto that *Wisedom*, and the various degrees of it but only that which God himself hath assigned thereunto, the *smell* would upon the matter be wholly taken away from the fire of our

Contentions. All men *have not*, nor let men pretend what they pleaſe to the contrary *ever had*, nor ever will have the ſame light, the ſame knowledg, the ſame ſpirituall Wiſdome and underſtanding, the ſame degree of aſſurance, the ſame *meaſure* of comprehenſion in the things of God. But whileſt they have the ſame *Rule*, the ſame *objective Revelation*, the uſe of the ſame means to grow ſpiritually wiſe in the knowledg of it, they have all the *agreement* that God hath appointed for them, or calls them unto. To frame for them all in *Rigid* confeſſions, or *Syſtemes* of ſuppoſed credible Propoſitions a *Procruſtes* bed to ſtretch them upon, or crop them unto the *ſize* of, ſo to reduce them to the ſame *opinion* in all things, is a vain and fruitleſs attempt that men have for many *Generations* wearied themſelves about, and yet continue ſo to do. Remove out of the way *Anathemas* upon *Propoſitions* arbitrarily compoſed and expreſſed, *Philoſophical* Concluſions, *Rules* of faith of a meer humane compoſure, or uſe them no otherwiſe but only to *teſtifie* the voluntary conſent of mens minds, in expreſſing to their own ſatisfaction the things which they do believe, and let men be eſteemed to *beleive* and to have attained degrees in the faith according as they are *taught of God*, with an allowance for every ones meaſure of means, light, grace, gifts, which are not things in our own Power, and we ſhall be nearer unto *quietneſs* than moſt men imagine. When Chriſtians had any unity in the world, the *Bible* alone was thought to contain their Religion, and every one endeavoured to *learn* the mind of God out of it, both by their *own endeavours*, and as they were inſtructed therein by their *guides*; neither did they purſue this work with any other end, but only that they might be *ſtrengthened* in their faith and hope, and learn to ſerve God and obey

obey him, that ſo they might come to the bleſſed enjoyment of him. Nor will there ever, I fear, be again any *Unity* among them, untill things are reduced to the *ſame ſtate* and condition. But among all the *vanities* that the minds of men are exerciſed with in this world, there is none to be compared unto that, of their hoping and *endeavouring* to bring all Perſons that profeſs the Religion of Jeſus Chriſt, to *acquieſce* in the *ſame opinions* about all *particulars*, which are any way determined to belong thereunto; eſpecially conſidering how *endleſly* they are multiplied and branched into inſtances, ſuch for ought appears the *firſt Churches* took little or no notice of; nay neither knew, nor underſtood any thing of them, in the *ſenſe* and *termes* wherein they are now propoſed as a *teſſera* of Communion among Chriſtians. In a word; leave *Chriſtian Religion* unto its *primitive Liberty*, wherein it was beleived to be *revealed* of God, and that *Revelation* of it to be contained in the *Scripture*, which men ſearched and ſtudied, to become themſelves, and to teach others to be *wiſe* in the knowledg of God, and living unto him, and the moſt of the *Conteſts* that are in the world, will quickly vaniſh and diſappear. But whileſt every one hath a *Confeſſion*, a *Way*, a *Church*, and its *Authority*, which muſt be impoſed on all others, or elſe he cryes to his neareſt relations

Lupis & agnis quanta ſortito obtigit
Tecum mihi diſcordia eſt.

We may look for Peace, *Moderation*, and *Unity*, when we are here no more, and not ſooner: So that

III. If thoſe *Theologicall Determinations* that make up at this day amongſt ſome men the greateſt part of thoſe Aſſertions, Poſitions, or Propoſitions, which are called *Articles of Faith*, or Truth, which are not delivered in the *words* that the Spirit of God teacheth, but in *termes* of Art, and in *Anſwer* unto Rules and

Notions, which the world might happily without any great disadvantage been *unacquainted* withall unto this day, had not *Aristotle* found them out, or stumbled on them, might be *eliminated* from the City of God, and Communion of Christians, and left for men to exercise their *wits* about who have nothing else to do, and the *Doctrine of Truth* which is according unto Godlineſs, left unto that *Noble*, Heavenly, Spirituall generous *amplitude* wherein it was delivered in the Scripture and beleived in the firſt Churches, innumerable *Cauſes* of ſtrife and Contentions would be taken away: but——*ferri video mea gaudia ventis*, ſmall hopes have I to ſee any ſuch *impreſſion* and conſent to befall the minds of concerned men; and yet I muſt confeſs, I have not one *jot more*, of the *reuniting* the Diſciples of Chriſt in love and concord. But moſt men that profeſs any thing of *Divinity*, have learned it as an *Art*, or humane Science; out of the road, compaſs, and track whereof, they know *nothing* of the mind of God; nay many ſcarce know the *things* in themſelves and as they are to be *believed*, which they are *paſſing skilfull* in, as they are expreſſed in their *arbitrary termes of Art*, which none almoſt underſtand but themſelves. And is it likely that ſuch men who are not a *few* in the world, will let go their *skill* and *knowledg*, and with them their reputation and advantage, and to ſacrifice them all to the *peace* and agreement that we are ſeeking after? Some learn their *Divinity* out of the late, and *Modern Schools*, both in the *Reformed* and *Papall Church*; in both which a *Science* is propoſed under that name, conſiſting in a *farrago of Credible Propoſitions*, aſſerted in termes ſuited unto that *Philoſophy* that is variouſly predominant in them. What a kind of *Theology* this hath praduced in the Papacy, *Agricola*, *Eraſmus*, *Vives*, *Janſenius*, with innumerable other Learned men of your

your own, have sufficiently declared. And that it hath any better success in the *Reformed Churches*, many things which I shall not now instance in, give me cause to doubt. Some boast themselves to learn their *Divinity* from the *Fathers*, and say they depart not from their sense and *idiome* of expression in what they beleive and profess: But we find by experience, that what for want of *Wisedom* and judgement in themselves, what for such reasons taken from the *Writings* which they make their *Oracles*, which I shall not insist upon, much of the Divinity of some of these men consists in that, which to avoid provocation I shall not express. Whilest men are thus *preingaged*, it will be very hard to prevail with them to think, that the greatest part of their *Divinity*, is such, that *Christian Religion*, either as to the *matter*, or at least as to that *mode* wherein alone they have *imbibed* it, is little or not at all concerned in; nor will it be easie to perswade them that it is a *Mystery* layed up in the Scripture; and all true Divinity a *Wisedom* in the Knowledg of that Mystery; and *skill* to live unto God accordingly; without which as I said before, we shall have *no Peace or agreement* in this world. *Nobis curiositate opus non est post Jesum Christum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium*, sayes *Tertullian*. *Curiosity after the Doctrine of Christ, and Philosophical all inquisitions (in Religion) after the Gospel belongs not unto us.* As we are

IV. It were well, if Christians would but seriously consider, what and *how many things they are wherein their present Apprehensions of the mind and will of God do center and agree*; I mean as to the *substance* of them, their nature and importance, and how far they will lead men in the wayes of *pleasing God*, and coming to the *enjoyment* of him. Were not an endeavour to this purpose *impeded* by many mens importunate cryes of *all* or *none*, as good *nothing at all*, as not *every thing*,

and

and that in this or that *way*, *mode*, or fashion; it might not a little conduce to the Peace of Christendom. And I must acknowledg unto you, that I think it is *prejudice*, Carnall interest, love of Power, and present enjoyments, with other Secular Advantages, joyned with *Pride*, Self-will and contempt of others, that keep the professours of Christianity from *conspiring* to improve this Consideration. But God help us, we are all for *Partyes*, and our own exact being in the *right*, and therein the *only Church* of Christ in the earth; at least that *others* are so, only *so far* as they agree with us, we being our selves the *Rule* and *Standard* of all Gospell Church state, laying weight upon what we *differ* from others in, for the most part exceedingly *above* what it doth deserve. Were the *same mind in us that was in Christ Jesus*, the same frame of spirit that was in his blessed Apostles, we should be willing to try the *effects* of his love and care towards all that profess his Name, by a Sedate Consideration at least, how far he hath *instructed* them in the knowledg of his will, and what *effects* this learning of him may produce. And to tell you truly; I do not think there is a more *horrid monster* in the earth than that opinion is, which in the *great diversity* that there is among Christians in the world, includes *happiness* and *Salvation* within the limits and precincts of any party of them; as though Christ, and the Gospell, their own *faith*, *obedience*, and sufferings, could not possibly do them any good in their station and condition. This is that *Alecto*, ——— *Cui tristia bella*

Iraque insidiæque & crimina noxia Cordi,
Odit & ipse pater Pluton, odere sorores
Tartareæ Monstrum: Tot sese vertit in ora.
Tam sævæ facies, tot pullulat atra Colubris.

Whereever this *opinion* takes place, which indeed bids defiance to the *Goodness* of God, and the *blood* of Christ

with

with a *Gigantick* boldness, for men to talk of *Moderation*, *Unity*, and *Peace*, is to mock others and to befool themselves in things of the greatest importance in the world: *altera manu ostentant panem, altera lapidem ferunt*: for my own part, I have not any firmer perswasion in and about these things, nor that yields more *satisfaction* and contentment unto my mind in reflections upon it, than this; that if a man *sincerely beleive all that, and only that, wherein all Christians in the world agree, and yield obedience unto God according to the guidance of what he doth so beleive, not neglecting or refusing the knowledg of any one Truth that he hath sufficient means to be instructed in, he need not go unto any Church in the world to secure his Salvation: Hic murus aheneus esto.* It is true, it is the Duty of such a man, to joyn himself unto *some Church* of Christ or other, which walks in professed subjection unto his institutions, and in the observation of his appointments. But to think that his not *being* of, or *joyning* with this or that Society, should cut him off from all hopes of a *blessed eternity*, is but to entertain a *viper* in our minds, or to act suitably to the Principles of the *old Serpent*, and to put forth the venome of of his poyson. Some of the *Antients* indeed tell us, *that out of the Catholick Church there is no Salvation.* And so say I also; but withall, that the *beleif* mentioned of the Truths generally embraced by Christians in their present divisions in the world, (I still speak of the most famous and numerous Societies of them,) and its *profession*, do so constitute a man a member of the *Catholick Church*, that whilest he *walks answerably* to his profession, it is not in the power of this, or that, no not of *all the Churches* in the world, to *divest* him of that Priviledg. Nor can all these cryes that are in the world, *We are the Church*, and *we are the Church*; you are not the Church, and you are not the Church, perswade me but that as *every Assembly* in the generall notion of it is a Church, so every Assembly of Christians that ordinarily meet to worship God in Christ according to his appointment, is a Church of Christ,

Hac mi pater
Te dicere aquum fuit & id defendere When

When you talked of *Moderation* and Unity, ſuch Principles as theſe, had better become you, than thoſe which you either privately *couched* in your Diſcourſe, or openly inſiſted on. Men that think of Reducing *unity* among Chriſtians, upon the preciſe terms of that *Truth* which they ſuppoſe themſelves *in ſolidum* poſſeſſors of, *Ipſi ſibi ſomnia fingunt*, do but entertain themſelves with *pleaſant dreams*, which a little Conſideration may awake them from. Charity, condeſcenſion, a retrenchment of opinions with a rejection of ſecular intereſts, and a deſign for the *purſuit of generall obedience*, without any ſuch reſpect to the *Particular incloſures* which diverſity of opinions and different meaſures of Light and Knowledge have made in the field of the Lord as ſhould *confine* the effects of any *Duty* towards the Diſciples of Chriſt, unto thoſe within them, with the *like aſſings of minds* ſuited unto the example of Jeſus Chriſt, muſt introduce the *deſired Unity*, or wee ſhall expect it in vain.

Theſe are ſome of my *haſty thoughts* upon the Principles of *Proteſtants* before mentioned, which you and others, may make uſe of, as you and they pleaſe. In the mean time, I ſhall pray that we may amidſt all our *Differences*, *love* one another, *pray* for one another, *wait patiently* for the communication of farther Light unto one another, *leave* evil ſurmizes, and much more the *condemning* and ſeeking the ruine of thoſe that diſſent from us, which men uſually do on *various* pretences, moſt of them *falſe* and *coyned* for the preſent purpoſe. And when we can *arrive* thereunto, I ſhall hope that from ſuch *generall Principles* as before mentioned, ſomewhat may be *advanced* towards the Peace of Chriſtians; and that there will be ſo, when the whole *concernment* of Religion ſhall in the Providence of God be *unravelled* from that *worldly* and *ſecular intereſt*, wherewith it hath been wound up and entangled for ſundry Ages; and when men ſhall not be *ingaged* from their *cradles* to their *graves* in a precipitate *Zeal* for any Church, or way of Profeſſion, by outward Advantages inſeparably mixed and blended with it before they came into the world. In the mean time, to expect *unity* in profeſſion, by the *Reduction* of all men to a preciſe agreement in *all the Doctrines* that have been and are ventilated among Chriſtians, and in all Acts and wayes of worſhip; is to refer the *Supream* and laſt Determination of things evangelical to the ſword ſecular power, and violence; and to inſcribe *vox ultima Chriſti*, upon great *guns* and other engines of war; ſeing otherwiſe it will not be effected, and what may be done this way I know not.

Sponte tonat cœunt ipſa ſine flamine nubes.

CHAP.

CHAP. 10.

Further Vindication of the ſecond Chapter of the Animadverſions; the remaining Principles of Fiat Lux *conſidered.*

IT is time to return, and put an end unto our review of thoſe *Principles*, which I obſerved your Diſcourſe to be built upon. The next as laid down in the *Animadverſions*, p. 103. is, *That the Pope is a good man, one that ſeeks nothing but our good, that never did us harm, but hath the Care and inſpection of us committed unto him by Chriſt.* In the Repetition hereof you leave out all the laſt part, and expreſs no more, but *the Pope is a good man, and ſeeks nothing but our good*: and therein aim at a double advantage unto your ſelf. Firſt, That you may with ſome *colour* of Truth, though *really* without it, deny the Aſſertion to be yours, when as the *latter part* of it, which upon the matter, is that which gives the ſence, and determines the meaning of the whole, is *expreſly* contended for by you, and that *frequently*, and at large. Secondly, That you may vent an empty *Cavill* againſt that expreſſion, *ſeeks nothing, but our good*; whereas had you added the next words, *and never did us harm*, every one would have perceived in what ſenſe the *former* were ſpoken, and ſo have prevented the frivolous exception. Your words are, *This alſo I nowhere aver, for I never ſaw him, nor have any ſuch acquaintance with him as to know whither he be a good man, or no: though in charity I do not uſe to judge hardly of any body; much leſs could ſay, that he whom I know to have a general ſollicitude for all Churches, ſeeks nothing but our good.*

Sir if I had pondered my words in Fiat Lux *no better then you heed yours in your Animadverſions upon it; they might even go together both of them to lay up Pepper and Spices, or ſome yet more vile employment.*

For what you have ſaid of the *Pope*, I deſire the Reader to conſult your *Paragraph* ſo entitled: and if he find not that you have ſaid *ten times more* in the commendation of him then I intimated in the words layed down for your *Principle*, I am content to be eſteemed to have done you wrong. You have indeed not only ſet him out as *a good man*, but have made him *much more then a man*, and have aſcribed that unto him, which is not *lawful* to be aſcribed unto any man whatever. Some of your *Expreſſions* I have again reminded you of; and many others of the ſame nature might be inſtanced in: and what you can ſay *more* of him then you have done, unleſs you would exalt him above *all that is called God*, and worſhipped; unleſs you ſhould ſet him in *the Temple of God*, and ſhew *him that he is God*, I know not. Let the Reader if he pleaſe, conſult your expreſſions, where you have placed them; I ſhall *ſtain Paper* with them no more. And you do but trifle with us, when you tell us that *you know not the Pope, nor have any ſuch acquaintance with him, as to know whether he be a good man or no.* As though your perſonal *acquaintance* with this or that Pope, belonged at all to our queſtion. Although I muſt needs ſay, that it ſeems very ſtrange unto me, that you ſhould hang the weight of Religion, and the ſalvation of your own ſoul, upon one of whom *you know not ſo much as whither he be a good man, or no.* For my *part* I am perſwaded there is no ſuch hardſhip in Chriſtian Religion, as that we ſhould be bound to believe, that all the ſafety of our Faith and Salvation depends

on

on a *man*, and he ſuch an one as concerning whom we know not whither he be *a good man or no*. The Apoſtle layes the foundation of our hope in better ground, *Heb.* 1. 1, 2, 3. And yet what ever opinion you may have of your *preſent Pope*, you are forced to be at this indifferency about his *honeſty*, becauſe you are not able to deny but that very many of his Predeceſſors, on whoſe ſhoulders the weight of all your Religion lay, no leſs then you ſuppoſe it doth on his who now ſwayes the *Papal Scepter*, were very brutes, ſo far from *being good men*, as that they may be reckoned amongſt the *worſt* in the world. Proteſtants as I ſaid, are perſwaded that their *faith* is laid up in better hands. With the latter part of my words, as by you ſet down, you play *ſophiſtically*, that you might ſay ſomething to them: (as to my knowledge, I never obſerved any man ſo hard put to it, to ſay ſomewhat, were it right or wrong) which ſeems to be the utmoſt of your deſign. You *feign* the ſenſe of my words to be, *that the Pope doth no other thing in the world* but ſeek our good: and confute me by ſaying, that *he hath a general ſollicitude for all Churches*. But Sir, I ſaid not, *he doth nothing but ſeek our good*; but only, *he ſeeks nothing but our good, and never did us harm*. And you may quickly ſee how cauſeleſly you fall into a contemplation of your *accuracy* in your *Fiat*, and of the looſneſs of my expreſſions in the *Animadverſions*. For although I acknowledge that diſcourſe to have been written in greater haſte then perhaps the ſeverer judgements of learned men might well allow of, as is alſo this *return* unto your *Epiſtle*, being both of them proportioned rather unto the *merit* of your Diſcourſe, then that of the Cauſe in agitation between us; yet I cannot ſee that you or any man

elſe, hath any juſt cauſe to except againſt this *expreſſion* of my intention, which yet is the *only one*, that in that kind, falls under your cenſure. For whereas I ſay, that the *Pope ſeeks nothing but our good*, and *that he never did us harm*, would any man living but your ſelf, underſtand theſe words any otherwiſe, but with reference unto them of whom I ſpake? that is as to us, he *ſeeks nothing but our good*, whatever he doth in the world beſides. And is it not a *wild* interpretation, that you make of my words, whileſt you ſuppoſe me to intimate, that *abſolutely* the Pope *doth nothing in the world*, or hath no other buſineſs at all that he concerns himſelf in, *but only the ſeeking of our good in particular*? If you cannot allow the books that you read the common *Civility* of interpreting things indefinitely expreſſed in them, with the limitations that the ſubject matter whereof they treat requires, you had better employ your time in any thing then ſtudy, as being not able to underſtand many lines in any *Author* you ſhall read. Nor are ſuch expreſſions to be avoided in our common diſcourſe. If a man talking of *your Fiat* ſhould ſay that *you do nothing but ſeek the good of your Countreymen*, would you interpret his words, as though he denyed that you *ſay Maſs*, and *hear Confeſſions*, or to intimate that you do nothing but *write Fiats*? and you know with whom lies both *jus & norma loquendi*.

The tenth and laſt Principle is, *That the Devotion of Catholicks far tranſcends that of Proteſtants*; ſo you now expreſs it: what you mention being but one part of three, that the *Animadverſions* ſpeak unto. Hereunto you reply; *But Sir, I never made in* Fiat Lux *any Compariſons between your Devotions; nor can I ſay how much the one is, or how little the other*:

other: but you are the maddeſt Commentator that I have ever ſeen: you firſt make the Text, and then Animadverſions upon it. Pray Sir have a *little patience*, and learn from this inſtance not to be too confident upon your memory for the future. I ſhall rather think that *fails you* at preſent, then your Conſcience; but a *failure* I am ſure there is, and you ſhall take the liberty to charge it where you pleaſe, which is more then every one would allow you. I would indeed *deſironſly* free my ſelf from the labour of *tranſcribing* ought that you have written to this purpoſe in your *Fiat*; and only refer you to the places which you ſeem to have forgotten. But becauſe this is the *laſt inſtance* of this kind that we are to treat about, and you have by degrees raiſed your *Confidence, in denying your own words* to that height, as to accuſe them *of madneſs*, who do but remind you of them; I ſhall repreſent once again unto you what you have written to this purpoſe; and I am perſwaded upon your review of it, you will *like it ſo well*, as to be ſorry that ever you diſowned it. I ſhall inſtance only in one place, which is *Sect.* 22. *p.*270,271. where your words are theſe, *When I beheld* (in the Catholick Countreys) *the deep reverence and earneſt Devotion of the people, the Majeſty of their Service, the Gravity of their Altars, the decency of their Prieſts; certainly ſaid I within my ſelf, this is the Houſe of God, the Gate of Heaven. Alaſs our Churches in* England *as they be now, be as ſhort of thoſe, either for decency, uſe, or piety, as ſtables to a Princely Pallace. There they be upon their knees all the week long at their prayers, many of them conſtantly an hour together in the morning, and half an hour he that is leaſt; and my houſe ſaid God, is the houſe of Prayer; but our*

Churches are either ſhut up all the week, or if they be open, are wholly taken up with boyes ſhouting, running and gambolling all about. On Sundayes *indeed our people ſit quiet, and decently dreſt, but to bow the knee is quite out of faſhion; and if any one chance to do it, as it is rare to behold, ſo he is very nimble at it, and as ſoon up as down, as if he made a courtſhip with his knees, and only tryed if his nerves and ſinews were as good to bow as to ſtand upright, and our whole Religious work here, is to ſit quietly whileſt the Miniſter ſpeaks upon a Text,* —— *and that we ſpend all our dayes, ever learning and teaching,* &c. If this Diſcourſe muſt be eſteemed *Text*, I pray tell me whoſe it is, yours or mine; or whether it doth not contain a *compariſon* between the Devotion of your *Catholicks* and *Proteſtants*; and whether that that of the *former* be not preferred above the other: And when you have done ſo, pray alſo tell me whether you ſuppoſe it an *honeſt and candid* way of handling matters of this importance, or indeed of any ſort whatever, for a man to ſay and unſay at his pleaſure, according unto what he apprehends to be for his preſent advantage. And whether a man may believe you, that you ſo *accurately* pondered the words of your *Fiat*, as you ſeem to pretend; ſeeing you dare not abide by what you have written, but diſclaim it! And yet I confeſs this may fall out, if your deſign in the weighing of your words, was ſo to place them, as to deceive us by them; which indeed it ſeems to have been. But it is your unhappineſs, that your words are brought unto other mens ſcales after they had ſo fairly paſſed your own. For the Devotion its ſelf (by the way) of Catholicks which you here *paint* forth unto us, it looks very ſuſpitiouſly to be painted. The

piety

piety of your Churches wherein they exceed ours, I confeſs I underſtand not; and your peop'es frequenting *publick places* to perform their *private devotions*, leans much to the old *Phariſaiſm*, which our Saviour himſelf hath branded to all eternity for *hypocriticall*, and carried on with little attendance unto his precept of making the *cloſet*, and that with the *door ſhut* upon the Devotioniſts, the moſt *proper ſeat* of private ſupplications. Beſides if their prayers conſiſt, as for the moſt part they do, in going over by *tale* a ſet number of ſayings which they little underſtand; you may do well to commend your *Devotion* to them that underſtand not one word of Goſpel for thoſe that do, will not attend unto it. And ſo I have once more paſſed through the *Principles* of your work, with a freſh diſcuſſion of ſome of them, which I tell you again I ſuppoſe ſufficient to ſatisfie *judicious and ingennous Perſons*, in the ſophiſtry and inconcluſiveneſs of the whole: My further proceedure being intended for the ſatisfaction of your ſelf, and ſuch others as have imbibed the *prejudices* which you endeavour to foreſtall your minds with all, and thereby have given no ſmall impeachment unto your *judgement* and ingenuity.

CHAP. 11.

Judicious Readers. Schoolmen the forgers of Popery. Nature of the Diſcourſe in Fiat Lux.

YOur enſuing Diſcourſes are ſuch as might well be paſſed by, as containing nothing ſerious or worth a review.

An paſſim ſequerer corvum?

Ludicrous *Similitudes*, with trifling exceptions to ſome words in the *Animadverſions*, cut off from that coherence wherein they are placed, are the chief ingredients of it. With theſe you aim with your wonted ſucceſs to make ſport:

——Venite in ignem
Pleni ruris & inficetiarum
Annales Volusi——

I wiſh we had agreed before hand,

Ut faceres tu quod velles, nec non ego poſſem,
Indulgere mihi.

That I might have been freed from the Conſideration of ſuch *trifles*: As the Caſe ſtands I ſhall make my paſſage through them with what ſpeed I can.

Firſt, You except againſt the *Cloſe* of the conſideration of your Principles, namely *that I would do ſo to my Book alſo, if I had none to deal with, but ingenuous and judicious Readers.* And tell me, that *it ſeems what follows is for Readers neither judicious, nor ingenuous.* But why ſo I pray? That which is written for the information of them who want either

judgement

judgement or ingenuity, may be alſo written for their uſe who have both. Neither did I ſpeak *abſolutely* of them that were ingenuous and judicious, but added alſo, that they were ſuch as had an acquaintance with the *ſtate of Religion of old, and at this day in* Europe, with the concernment of their own ſouls in theſe things. With ſuch as theſe, I ſuppoſed then, and do ſtill, that a diſcovery of the *Sophiſtry* of your Diſcourſe, and the falſeneſs of the Principles you proceeded on, was ſufficient to give them ſatisfaction as to the *uſeleſneſs* of the whole, without a particular *ventilating* of the flouriſhes that you made upon your ſandy foundations. But becauſe I know there were ſome, that might by the commendation of your friends light upon your Diſcourſe, that either being prepoſſeſſed by *prejudices* might want the ingenuity to examine particularly your Aſſertions and Inferences, or through unacquaintedneſs with the *Stories* of ſome things, that you referred unto, might be diſenabled to make a right *judgement* of what you averred, I was willing to take ſome further pains alſo for your ſatisfaction. And what was herein done, or ſpoken amiſs, as yet I cannot diſcern. But I am perſwaded, that if you had not ſuppoſed that you had ſome of *little judgement* and *leſs ingenuity* to give ſatisfaction unto, you would never have pleaſed your ſelf, with the writing of ſuch *empty Trifles*, in a buſineſs wherein you pretend ſo great a concernment.

Pag. 31. You obſerve that I ſay, the *Schoolmen were the hammerers and forgers of Popery*: And add, *Alas Sir, I ſee that anger ſpoyls your memory; for in the twelfth and thirteenth Chapter you make Popery to be hammered and forged not a few hundreds of years before any Schoolmen were extant; And therefore tell*

me

me that I hate the Schoolmen as the Frenchmen do Talbot, *for having been frightened with them formerly*;

Sed risu inepto res ineptior nulla est.

I confess the *language* of your Schoolmen is so corrupt and barbarous, many of the *things* they sweat about, so vain, curious, unprofitable, their *way* of handling things, and expressing the notions of their minds, so *perplexed*, dark, obscure, and oftentimes unintelligible, divers of their *Assertions* and suppositions so horrid and monstrous; the whole *system* of their pretended Divinity, so *aliene* and forreign unto the mysterie of the Gospel that I know no great reason that any man hath much to delight in them. These things have made them the sport and scorn of the learnedest men that ever lived in the Communion of your own Church. What one said of old of others, may be well applyed unto them.

Statum lacessunt omnipotentis Dei
Calumniosis litibus.
Fidem minutis dissecant ambagibus
Ut quisq; est lingnar negnior.
Solvunt ligantq; quæstionum vincula
Per Syllogismos plectiles.

Indeed to see them come forth *harnassed* with *Syllogismes* and *Sophisms*, attended with *Obs* and *Sols*, speaking part the language of the *Jews*, and part the language of *Ashdod*, fighting and contending amongst themselves, as if they had sprung from the *teeth of Cadmus* Serpent, subjecting all the properties, decrees and actions of the holy God to your *profane bablings*, might perhaps beget some fear in the minds of men not much guilty of want of Constancy,

stancy, as the sight of the *Harpyes* did of old to *Ænaas* and his Companions, of whom they gave that account,

> *Tristius haud illis monstrum nec sævior ulla*
> *Pestis, & ira Deum, Stygiis sese extulit undis.*
> *Vidimus, & subita gelidus formidine sanguis*
> *Diriguit, cecidêre animi.*

But the Truth is, there is no real cause of *fear* of them: They are not like to do mischief to any, unless they are resolved aforehand to give up their *faith* in the things of God to the Authority of this or that *Philosopher*, and forego all solid rational consideration of things, to betake themselves to *Sophistical canting*, and the winding up of subtilty into plain non-sence; which oftentimes befalls the best of them; Whence *Melchior Canus* one of your selves sayes of some of your learned Disputes, *Puderet me dicere non intelligere, si ipsi intelligerent qui tractarunt. I should be ashamed to say I did not understand them, but that they understood not themselves.* Others may be entangled by them, who if they cannot *unty your knots*, they may break your webbs, especially when they find the *Conclusions*, as oftentimes they are, directly contrary to Scripture, right reason, and natural sense it self. For they are the genuine off-spring of the old *Sophisters* whom *Lucian* talks of in his *Menippus*, or νεκρομαντία, and tells us that in hearing the Disputations, τὸ πάντων δεινῶν ἀτοπυτατον, ὅτι περὶ τῶν ἐναντιωτάτων ἕκαστος αὐτῶν, λέγων σφόδρα νεκοῦντας καὶ πιθανοὺς λόγους ἐπορίζετο, ὥστε μήτε τῷ θερμὸν τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα λέγοντι, μήτε τῷ ψυχρὸν ἀντιλέγειν ἔχειν, καὶ ταῦτα εἰδότα σαφῶς ὡς οὐκ ἄν ποτε θερμόν τι εἴη καὶ ψυχρὸν ἐν ταυτῷ χρόνῳ. *That*, saith he, *which seemed the most absurd of all, was, that*

that when they disputed of things absolutely contrary, they yet brought invincible and perswasive reasons to prove what they said: so that I durst not speak a word against him that affirmed hot and cold to be the same, although I knew well enough that the same thing could not be hot and cold at the same time. And therefore he tells us that in hearing of them, he did like a man half asleep, sometimes *nod* one way, and sometimes another, which is certainly the *deportment* of the generality of them who are conversant in the *wrangles* of your Schoolmen. But whatever I said of them, or your Church, is perfectly consistent with its self, and the Truth. I grant that before the *Schoolmen* set forth in the world, many *unsound opinions* were broached in, and many *Superstitious practices* admitted into your Church: and a great pretence raised unto a *Superintendency* over other Churches, which were parts of that *Mass* out of which your Popery is formed. But before the *Schoolmen* took it in hand, it was *rudis indigestaq; moles*, an heap, not an house. As *Rabbi Juda Hakkadosh* gathered the *passant Traditions* of his own time among the Jews, into a body or Systeme, which is called the *Mishna* or Duplicate of their Law, wherein he composed a new Religion for them, sufficiently distant from that which was professed by their fore-fathers; so have *your Schoolmen* done also. Out of the *passant Traditions* of the dayes wherein they lived, blended with *Sophistical* corrupted notions of their own, countenanced and gilded with the sayings of some *Ancient Writers* of the Church, for the most part wrested or misunderstood, they have hammered out that *Systeme of Philosophical Traditional Divinity*, which is now enstamped with the Authority of the *Tridentine Council*,

cil, being as far diſtant from the Divinity of the New Teſtament, as the *Farrago* of Traditions collected by *Rabbi Juda*, and improved in the *Talmuds*, is from that of the old.

Pag. 33, 34, 35. Having nothing elſe to ſay, you fall again upon my *pretended miſtake*, of conſidering that as *ſpoken abſolutely by you, which you ſpake only upon ſuppoſition*; and talk of *Metaphyſical Speculations in your* Fiat, *which you conceive me very unmeet to deal withal*; *and direct me to* Bellarmines *Catechiſm, as better ſuiting my inclination and capacity*. But Sir, we are not wont here in *England* to account *cloudy dark Sophiſtical declamations* to be *Metaphyſical Speculations*; nor every feigned ſuppoſition to be a Philoſophical abſtraction. I wiſh you would be perſwaded that there is not the leaſt *tincture* of any ſolid *Metaphyſicks* in your whole Diſcourſe. It may be indeed you would be angry with them that ſhould undeceive you; and cry out,

——*Pol me occidiſtis amici,*
Non Servâſtis,

As he did,

Cui demptus per vim mentis gratiſſimus Error.

You may perhaps pleaſe your ſelf with conceits of your *Metaphyſical atchievements*; but yonr friends cannot but pitty you to ſee your vanity. The leaſt youth in our *Univerſities* will tell you, that to make a *general Suppoſition true or falſe*, and to flouriſh upon it with words of a ſeeming probability, without any cogency or proof, belongs to *Rhetorick*, and not at all to *Metaphyſicks*. And this is the very nature of your Diſcourſe. Nor do I *miſtake* your aim in it, as you pretend: I grant in the place you would

would be thought to reply unto, though you speak not one word to the purpose, that your *enquiry is after a means of setling men in the Truth*, upon supposition that they are not yet attained thereunto; and you labour to shew the difficulty that there is in that attainment, upon the account of the insufficiency of *many mediums* that may be pretended to be used for that end. In answer unto your enquiry, I tell you directly, that the only means of setling men in the Truth of Religion, is *Divine Revelation*; and that this Revelation is *entirely* and *perfectly* contained in the Scripture, which therefore is a *sufficient means* of setling all men in the Truth. Suppose them *rasa tabulæ*, suppose them utterly *ignorant* of Truth; suppose them *prejudiced* against it; suppose them *divided* amongst themselves about it; the only safe, rational, secure way of bringing them all to settlement is their belief of the Revelation of God contained in the Scripture. This I manifested unto you in the *Animadversions*, whereunto you reply by a commendation of your own *Metaphysical Abilities* with the excellencies of your Discourse: without taking the least notice of my answer, or the reasons given you against that *Fanatical groundless credo*, which you would now again impose upon us.

CHAP.

CHAP. 12.

Falſe Suppoſitions, cauſing falſe and abſurd conſequences. Whence we had the Goſpel *in* England, *and by whoſe means. What is our Duty in reference unto them by whom we receive the Goſpel.*

PAg. 36. You inſiſt upon ſomewhat in particular that *looks* towards your purpoſe, which ſhall therefore be diſcuſſed; for I ſhall not willingly miſs any opportunity that you will afford me, of examining what ever you have to tender in the behalf of your *dying Cauſe*. You mind me therefore of my anſwer unto that diſcourſe of yours; *If the Papiſt or Roman Catholick who firſt brought us the news of Chriſtianity, be now become ſo odious; then may likewiſe the whole ſtory of Chriſtianity be thought a Romance. You ſpeak with the like extravagancy, and mind not my Hypothetick at all, to ſpeak directly to my inference as it became a man of Art to do: but neglecting my Conſequence, which in that Diſcourſe is principally and ſolely intended; you ſeem to deny my Suppoſition: which if my Diſcourſe had been drawn into a Syllogiſme, would have been the Minor of it. And it conſiſts of two Categories; Firſt, That the Papiſt is now become odious. Secondly, That the Papiſt delivered us the firſt news of Chriſtianity. The firſt of theſe you little heed: the ſecond you deny. That the Papiſt ſay you, or Roman Catholick firſt brought Chriſt and his Chriſtianity into this Land, is moſt untrue: I wonder,* &c. *And your reaſon is, becauſe if any Romans came hither, they were not Papiſts, and indeed our Chriſtianity came from the Eaſt. And this is all you ſay to my Hypothetick, or conditio-*

nal ratiocination, as if I had ſaid nothing at all, but that one abſolute Category, which being delivered before, I now only ſuppoſe. You uſe to call me a Civil Logician; but I fear a natural one as you are, will hardly be able to juſtifie this notion of yours as artificial. A Conditional hath a verity of its own, ſo far differing from the ſuppoſed Category, that this being falſe, that may yet be true. For example, if I ſhould ſay thus, A man who hath wings as an Eagle, or if a man had wings of an Eagle, he might flye in the ayre as well as another Bird; and ſuch an Aſſertion is not to be confuted by proving that a man hath not the Wings of an Eagle.

The ſubſtance of this whole Diſcourſe, is no more but this; that becauſe the Inference upon a Suppoſition, may be a Conſequence *Logically* true, though the Suppoſition be falſe, or faigned: therefore the *Conſequent*, or thing inferred alſo is *really true*, and a man muſt *fly in the ayre*, as you ſay, like *another Bird*. But Sir, though every *Conſequence* be true *Logically*, that is lawfully inferred from its *premiſes*, be they true or falſe; and ſo muſt in Diſputation be allowed: Yet where the *Conſequent* is the thing in Queſtion, to ſuppoſe that if the *Conſequence* be lawfully educed from the premiſes, that it alſo muſt be true, is a fond ſurmize. And therefore they know *qui nondum are lavantur*, that the way to diſappoint the concluſion of an *hypothetick Syllogiſme*, is to diſprove the *Category* included in the ſuppoſition, when reduced into an *Aſſumption* from whence it is to be inferred. For inſtance, if the thing in queſtion be, *Whether a man can fly in the ayre (as you ſay) like another Bird*; and to prove it, you ſhould ſay, *if he has wings he can do ſo*: the way I think to ſtop your progreſs, is to *deny that he*

he hath wings. And if you ſhould continue to *wrangle* that yonr Inference is good, *if he hath wings, he may fly like another Bird*, you would but make your ſelf ridiculous. But if you may be allowed to make *falſe and abſurd* ſuppoſitions, and muſt have them taken for granted, you are very much to blame if you inferr not *Concluſions* unto your own purpoſe. And this in general is your conſtant way of dealing: unleſs we will allow you to *ſuppoſe* your ſelves to be the Church, and that all the excellent things which are ſpoken of the Church, beloog unto you alone, with the like groundleſs preſumptions you are inſtantly mute, as if there had appeared unto you

Harpocrates digito qui ſignificat St.

But if in the caſe in agitation between us, I ſhould permit you without controul to make what *ſuppoſitions* you pleaſe, and to make *Inferences* from them, which muſt be admitted for truth, becauſe *Logically* following upon your ſuppoſitions, what *man of Art* I might have appeared unto you, I know not: I fear with others, I ſhould ſcarcely have preſerved the reputation of *Common ſenſe* or underſtanding. And I muſt acknowledge unto you, that I am ignorant of *that Logick* which teacheth men to ſuffer their *Adverſaries* to proceed and inferr upon abſurdities and falſe ſuppoſitions, to oppoſe the Truth which they maintain. And yet I know well enough what *Ariſtotle* hath taught us concerning τὸ λαμβάνειν τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ· ᾗ τὸ ἀναίτιον ὡς αἴτιον τιθέναι, in which part of his *Logick*, you ſeem to have been moſt converſant.

But let us once again conſider your *ratiocination* as here you endeavour to reinforce it. Your *ſup-*

Position you say *includes these two Categories*; *First*, *that the Papists are become odious unto us*: *Secondly*, *That the Papists delivered us the first news of Christianity*. Well, both these propositions I deny. *Papists* are not become odious unto us, though we love not their Popery: Papists did not bring us the first news of Christianity. This I have proved unto you already, and shall yet do it further. Will you now be angry and talk of *Logick*, because I grant not the *consequent* of these false pretensions to be *true*; as if every *Syllogisme* must of necessity be true *materially*, which is so in form. But yet farther, to discover your mistake, I was so willing to hear you *out* unto the utmost of what you had to say, *that in the Animadversions* after the discovery of the falsity of the Assertions that it arose from, I suffered your *supposition* to pass, and shewed you the weakness of your Inference upon it. And the reason of my so doing, was this; that because though the *Papists* brought not the Gopel first into *England*, yet I do not judge it impossible but that they may be the means of communicating it unto some other place or People; and I would be loth to grant, that they who receive it from them, must either alwayes embrace their *Popery*, or renounce the *Gospel*. I confess a great intanglement would be put on the thoughts and minds of such *Persons*, by the Principle of the *Infallibility* of them that sent your Teachers, whereinto it may be also they would labour to resolve your belief. But yet if withal you shall communicate unto them the *Gospel* its self, as the great *Repository* of the Mysteries of that Religion wherein your instruct them, there is a *sufficient foundation* laid for their reception of *Christianity*, and the rejection of your *Popery*. For when once the Gospel hath

hath evidenced its ſelf unto their *conſciences* that it is from God, as it will do, if it be received unto any *benefit* or advantage at all, they will, or may eaſily diſcern, that thoſe who brought it unto them, were themſelves in many things deceived in their *apprehenſions* of the mind of God therein revealed; eſpecially as to your pretence of the *Infallibility* of any man, or men, any further then his conceptions agree with what is revealed in that Goſpel which they have received, and now for its own ſake believe to be from God. And once to imagine, that when the Scripture is received by faith, and hath brought the ſoul into ſubjection to the Authority of God exerting it ſelf in it, and by it, that it will not warrant them in the rejection of any reſpect unto men whatever, is, *to err not knowing the Scripture, nor the Power of God.* In this condition of things, men will bleſs God for *any means* which he was pleaſed to uſe in the communicating the Goſpel unto them; and if thoſe who were employed in that work ſhall perſiſt in obtruding upon their faith and worſhip, things that are *not revealed,* they will quickly diſcover ſuch a contradiction in their Principles, as that it is *utterly impoſſible* that they ſhould rationally aſſent unto, and embrace them all, but either they muſt *renounce* the Goſpel which they have brought them, or reject thoſe other *Principles* which they would impoſe upon them that are contrary thereunto. And whither of thoſe they will do, upon a ſuppoſition that the *Goſpel* hath now obtained that *Authority* over their conſciences and minds, which it claims in and over all that receive it, it is no hard matter to determine. Men then who have themſelves mixed the *Doctrine* of the Goſpel with many *abominable errors* of their own,

may in the *Providence* of God be made instrumental to convey the Gospel unto others. At the first tender of it they may for the *Truths sake* which they are convinced of, receive also the *errors* that are tendered unto them, as being as yet not able to discern the *chaff* from the *wheat*. But when once the Gospel is rooted in their minds, and they begin to have their *senses exercised therein* to discern between good and evil, and their faith of the Truth they receive is resolved into the Authority of God himself the Author of the Gospel, they have their *warrant* for the rejection of the Errors which they had before imbibed, according as they shall be discovered unto them. For though they may first *consider* the Gospel on the proposition of them that first bring them the tidings of it, as the *Samaritans* came to our Saviour upon the information of the *woman*; yet when they come to experience themselves its power & efficacy, they believe it for its own sake, as *those* did also *in our Lord Jesus Christ* upon his own account; when this is done, they will be enabled to distinguish, as the Prophet speaks, *between a dream and a prophecy*, *between chaff and wheat*, between error and Truth. And thus if we should grant that the first *News of Christianity* was brought into *England* by Papists, yet it doth not at all follow, that if we reject *Popery*, we must also reject the Gospel or esteem it a *Romance*. For if we should have received *Popery*, we should have received it only upon the credit and *Authority* of them that brought it: but the Truth of Christianity we should have received on the Authority of the Gospel, which was brought unto us: So that our entertainment of *Popery* and *Christianity* standing not on the same bottom or foot of account, we might well reject the *one*, and retain the other.

other. But this conſideration as to us, is needleſs; they were not *Papiſts* which brought Chriſtianity firſt into this Land. Wherefore well knowing that the whole ſtrength of their reaſoning depends on the *ſuppoſition* that they were ſo, you proceed to confirm it in your manner, that is, by ſaying it over again. But we will hear you ſpeaking your own words.

We had not our Chriſtianity immediately from the Eaſt, nor from Joſeph *of* Arimathea, *we Engliſhmen had not. For as he delivered his Chriſtianity unto ſome Britans, when our Land was not called* England *but* Albion *or* Brittany, *and the inhabitants were not Engliſhmen but Britans or Kimbrians; ſo likewiſe did that Chriſtianity, and the whole news of it quite vaniſh, being ſuddenly overwhelmed by the antient deluge of Paganiſm; nor did it ever come from them to us: nay the Brittans themſelves had ſo forgot and loſt it, that they alſo needed a ſecond Converſion, which they received from Pope* Eleutherius: *And that was the only news of Chriſtianity which prevailed and laſted even amongſt the very Britans, which ſeems to me a great ſecret of Divine Providence in planting and governing his Church, as if he would have nothing to ſtand firm and laſting, but what was immediately fixed by, and ſeated upon that Rock: for all other converſions have variety, and the very ſeats of the other Apoſtles failed, that all might the better cement in the unity of one head: Nay the Tables which God wrote with his own hand were broken, but the other written by* Moſes *remained; that we might learn to give a due reſpect unto him, whom God hath ſet over us as our Head and Ruler under him, and none exalt himſelf againſt him. I know you will laugh at this my Obſervation: but I cannot but tell you what I think.*

Where I ſpeak then of the news of Chriſtianity firſt brought to this Land I mean not that which was firſt brought upon the earth or ſoyle of this Land, and ſpoken to any body then dwelling here, but which was delivered to the forefathers of the now preſent Inhabitants, who were Saxons or Engliſh men. And I ſay, that we the now preſent Inhabitants of England, *offſpring of the Saxons or Engliſh, had the firſt news of our Chriſtianity immediately from* Rome, *and from Pope* Gregorius *the Roman Patriarch, by the hands of his Miſſioner St.* Auſtin. *Sith then the Categorick Aſſertions are both clear, namely that the Papiſts firſt brought us the news of Chriſtianity: and Secondly, that the Papiſt is now become odious unto us: What ſay you to my Conſequent? that the whole ſtory of Chriſtianity may as well be deemed a Romance, as any part of that Chriſtianity we at firſt received, is now judged to be a part of a Romance. This Conſequence of mine, it behoved a man of thoſe great parts you would be thought to have, to heed attentively, and yet you never minded it.*

Some few Obſervations upon this Diſcourſe of yours, will further manifeſt the *Abſurdity* of that Conſequence, which you feign not to have been taken notice of in the *Animadverſions*, for which you had no cauſe, but that you might eaſily diſcern that it did not deſerve it. 1. Then you grant that the *Goſpel* came out of the *Eaſt* into this Land. So then we did not firſt receive the Goſpel from *Rome*, much leſs by the means of *Papiſts*. But the Land was then called *Albion*, or *Brittany*, and the people *Brittans* or *Kimbrians*, not *Engliſhmen*. What then, though the names of places or people are changed, the Goſpel whereever it is, is ſtill the ſame. But the *Brittans* loſt the Goſpel until they had a new Converſion

from

from *Rome* by the means of *Eleutherius*. But you fail Sir, and are either *ignorant* in the ſtory of thoſe times, or elſe wilfully pervert the truth. All the Fathers and favourers of that *Story*, agree, that Chriſtianity was well rooted and known in *Brittain*, when *Lucius* as is pretended, ſent to *Eleutherius* for *Aſſiſtance* in its propagation. Your own *Baronius* will aſſure you no leſs, *ad An.* 183. *n.* 3, 4. *Gildas de Excid.* will do it more fully. *Virunnius* tells us, that the *Brittans* were then *ſtrengthened in the faith*, not that they then received it: *Strengthened* in what they had, not newly *converted*, though ſome as it is ſaid, were ſo. And the dayes of *Lucius* are aſſigned by *Sabellicus*, as the time wherein the *whole Province* received the name of Chriſt, *publicitus cum ordinatione*, by publick decree: That it was received there *before*, and abode there, as in *other places* of the world under perſecution, all men agree. In this interval of time did the Britiſh Church bring forth *Claudia*, *Ruffina*, *Elvanus* and *Medwinus*, whoſe names amongſt others are yet preſerved. And to this ſpace of time do the Teſtimonies of *Tertullian ad Judæ*, and of *Origen. Hom.* 4. *in Ezek.* concerning Chriſtianity in *Brittain* belong. Beſides, if the only prevalent Religion in *Brittany* were as you fancy that which came from *Rome*, how came the Obſervation of *Eaſter* both amongſt the *Brittans*, as *Beda* manifeſts, and the *Scots*, as *Petrus Cluniacenſis* declares to be anſwerable to the Cuſtoms of the *Eaſtern* Church, and contrary to thoſe of the *Roman*? Did thoſe that came from *Rome* teach them to do that which they judged their duty not to do? But what need we ſtay in the confutation of this figment? The very *Epiſtle of Eleutherius* manifeſts it abundantly ſo to be. If there be any thing of

Truth in that *reſcript*, it doth not appear that *Lucius* wrote any thing unto him about *Chriſtian Religion*, but about the *Imperial Laws* to govern his Kingdom by; and *Eleutherius* in his anſwer plainly intimates that the Scripture was received amongſt the *Brittans*, and the Goſpel much diſperſed over the whole Nation. And yet this *figment* of your own you make the *Bottom* of a moſt ſtrange contemplation; namely that God in his *Providence would have all that Chriſtianity fail which came not from Rome.* That is the meaning of thoſe expreſſions, *he would have nothing ſtand firm or laſting, but what was immediately fixed by, and ſeated on that Rock, for all other Converſions have vaniſhed.* Really Sir, I am ſorry for you, to ſee what wofull ſhelves your *prejudicate Opinions* do caſt you upon, who in your ſelf ſeem to be *a well meaning goodnatured man.* Do you think indeed that thoſe *Converſions* that were wrought in the world by the means of any Perſons not coming from *Rome*, which were Chriſt himſelf and all his Apoſtles, were not fixed on the *Rock?* Can ſuch a blaſphemous thought enter into your heart? If thoſe primitive *Converts* that were called unto the faith by Perſons coming out of the *Eaſt*, were not built on the *Rock*, they all periſhed everlaſtingly every ſoul of them; and if the other Churches planted by them, were not immediately fixed and ſeated on the *Rock*, they went all to Hell, the *Gates* of it prevailed againſt them. Do you think indeed that God ſuffered all the Churches in the world to come to *nothing*, that all Chriſtians might be brought into ſubjection to your *Pope*, which you call *cementing in an Unity of one Head?* If you do ſo, you *think wickedly, that he is altogether like unto your ſelf; but he will reprove you, and ſet your faults*

faults in order before your eyes. Such horrible diſmal thoughts do men allow themſelves to be converſant withall, who are reſolved to *ſacrifice* Truth, Reaſon and Charity unto their prejudices and intereſts. Take heed Sir, leaſt the *Rock* that you boaſt of, prove not *ſeven hills* and deceive you. In the perſuit of the ſame Conſideration, you tell me, *that I will laugh at your Obſervation, that the Tables written by Gods own hand were broken, but thoſe written by* Moſes *remained, that we may learn to give a due reſpect to him whom God hath ſet over us.* But you do not well to ſay ſo; I do not *laugh* at your obſervation, but I really pitty you that make it. Pray Sir, what were thoſe *Tables* that were *written by Moſes*, when thoſe written by God were broken? Such *miſtakes* as theſe you ever and anon fall into, and I fear for want of being converſant in *Holy Writ*, which it ſeems your Principles prompt you unto a neglect of. Sir, the *Tables* prepared by *Moſes* were no leſs *written with the finger of God*, then thoſe were which he firſt prepared himſelf: *Exod.* 24.28. *Deut.* 10.1,2,4. And if you had laid a good ground for your notion, that the *Tables* prepared by God were broken, and thoſe *hewed* by *Moſes* preſerved: and would have only added what you ought to have done, that there *was nothing in the Tables* delivered unto the people by *Moſes*, but what was written by the finger of God, I ſhould have commended both it, and the inference you make from it. As it is built by you on the ſand, it would fall with its own weight, were it no *heavier* then a feather. But you lay great ſtreſs I ſuppoſe on that which follows: namely, that the *Brittans* being expelled by the *Saxons*, the *Saxons* firſt received their Chriſtianity from *Rome*. You may remember what hath been told

told you already in answer to this Case, about *Romes* being left without inhabitants by *Totilas*. Besides if we that are now Inhabitants of *England* must be thought to have first received the Gospel then when it was first preached unto our *own Progenitors* in a direct line ascending, this will be found a matter so dubious and uncertain, as not possibly to be a thing of any concernment in Christian Religion; and moreover will exempt most of the *chief families* of *England* from your enclosure, seeing one way or other they derive themselves from the *Antient Britains*. Such pittifull trifles are you forced to make use of, to give countenance unto your cause. But let it be granted that Christianity was first communicated unto the *Saxons* from *Rome* in the dayes of Pope *Gregory*, which yet indeed is not true neither: for Queen *Berta* with her Bishop *Luidhardus* had both practised the worship of Christ in *England* before his coming, and so prepared the people, that *Gregory* sayes in one of his Epistles, *Anglorum gentem voluisse fieri Christianam*. What will thence ensue? why plainly, that we must be all *Papists* or Atheists, and esteem the whole Gospel a *Romance*. But why so I pray? Why, the *Categorick Assertions are both clear*; namely, that the Papist first brought us the news of Christianity; and that Papists are now odious. But how comes this about? we were talking of *Gregory*, and some that came from *Rome* in his dayes. And if you take them for *Papists*, you are much deceived. Prove that there was one *Papist* at *Rome* in the dayes of that *Gregory*, and I will be another; I mean such a *Papist* as your present *Pope* is, or as your self are. Do you think that *Gregory* believed the Catholick Supremacy and Infallibility of the Pope, the doing whereof in an especial manner con-

conſtitutes a man a Papiſt. If you have any ſuch thoughts, you are an utter *ſtranger* to the ſtate of things in thoſe dayes, as alſo to the writings of *Gregory* himſelf. For your better information you may do well to conſult him, *lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 32, 36, 38. And ſundry other inſtances may be given out of his own writings, how remote he was from your *preſent Popery*. Irregularities and ſuperſtitious obſervations were, not a few in his dayes crept into the Church of *Rome*, which you ſtill pertinaciouſly adhere unto, as you have the happineſs to adhere firmely unto any thing that you once irregularly embrace. But that the main Doctrines, Principles, Practices and Modes of Worſhip which conſtitute *Popery*, were known, admitted, practiſed, or received at *Rome* in the dayes of *Gregory*, I know full well that you are not able to prove. And by this you may ſee the Truth of your firſt Aſſertion, that *Papiſts brought us the firſt news of Chriſtianity*: which you do not in the leaſt endeavour to prove; but take it hand over head, to be the ſame with this, that *ſome from* Rome *preached the Goſpel to the Saxons in the dayes of* Gregory, which it hath no manner of affinity withall. Your ſecond true Aſſertion is, that the *Papiſt is now become odious unto us*; but yet neither will this be granted you. *Popery* we diſlike, but that the *Papiſts* are become odious unto us, we abſolutely deny. Though we like not the *Popery* they have admitted, yet we love them for the *Chriſtianity* which they have retained. And muſt not that needs be a doubty Conſequence that is educed out of Principles wherein there is not a word of truth? Beſides, I have already in part manifeſted unto you, that ſuppoſing *both* of them to be true, as *neither* of them is, yet your Conſequence is altogether inconſequent, and

and will by no means follow upon them. And this will yet more fully appear in an examination of your enſuing Diſcourſe.

That which you fix upon to accept againſt, is towards the cloſe of my Diſcourſe to this purpoſe in theſe words as ſet down by you, pag. 40. *Many things delivered us at firſt with the firſt news of Chriſtianity, may be afterwards rejected for the love of Chriſt, and by the Commiſſion of Chriſt.* The truth of this Aſſertion I have newly proved again unto you, and have exemplified it in the inſtance of *Papiſts* bringing the firſt news of Chriſtianity to any place, which is not impoſſible but they may do, though to this Nation they did not. I had alſo before confirmed it with ſuch reaſons as you judged it beſt to take no notice of; which is your way with things that are too hard for you to grapple withall. I muſt I ſee, *drive* theſe things through the thick *obſtacles* of your prejudices with more inſtances, or you will not be ſenſible of them. What think you then of thoſe who received the firſt news of Chriſtianity by believers of the *circumciſion*, who at the ſame time taught them the neceſſity of being circumciſed, and of *keeping Moſes Law*? were they not bound afterwards upon the diſcovery of the *miſtake* of their teachers to *retain* the Goſpel, and the truth thereof taught by them, and to *reject* the obſervation of *Moſaical* rites and obſervations? or were they free upon the diſcovery of their miſtake to eſteem the whole *Goſpel a Romance?* What think you of thoſe that were converted by *Arians*, which were great multitudes, and ſome whole Nations? were not thoſe Nations bound for the *Love of Chriſt*, by his word, to retain their Chriſtianity, and reject their *Arianiſme*, or muſt they needs account the whole

Goſpel

Goſpel a fable, when they were convinced of the Errour of their firſt teachers, denying Chriſt Jeſus in his Divine nature to be of the ſame ſubſtance with his Father, or eſſentially God! To give you an inſtance that it may be will pleaſe you better; There are very many *Indians* in *New England* or elſewhere Converted unto Chriſtianity by *Proteſtants*, without whoſe inſtruction they had never received the leaſt rumor or report of it. Tell me your judgement; if you were now amongſt them, would you not endeavour to perſwade them that *Chriſtian Religion* indeed was true, but that their *firſt Inſtructers* in it had deceived them as to many particulars of it, which you would undeceive them in, and yet keep them cloſe to their Chriſtianity! And do you not know that many who have in former dayes been by *Hereticks* converted to Chriſtianity from *Paganiſm*, have afterwards from the Principles of their Chriſtianity been convinced of their *hereſie*, and retaining the one, have rejected the other? It is not for your advantage to maintain an oppoſition againſt ſo evident a Truth, and exemplified by ſo many inſtances in all ages. I know well enough the ground of your *pertinaciouſneſs* in your miſtake, it is that men who receive the Goſpel, do reſolve their faith into the Authority of them that firſt preach it unto them. Now this *ſuppoſition* is openly falſe and univerſally as to all perſons what ever not divinely inſpired, yea as to the Apoſtles themſelves but only with reſpect unto their working of Miracles, which gave Teſtimony unto the Doctrine that they taught. Otherwiſe Gods Revelation contained in the *Scriptures* is that which the *faith* of men is formally and ultimately reſolved into; ſo that what ever Propoſitions that are made unto them, they may reject, unleſs

leſs they do it with a *non obſtante* for its ſuppoſed Revelation, the whole Revelation abides unſhaken, and their faith founded thereon. But as to the *Perſons* who firſt bring unto any the tidings of the Goſpel, ſeeing the faith of them that receive it, is not reſolved into their *Authority or Infallibility*, they may, they ought to examine their propoſals by that unerring word which they ultimately reſt upon, as did the *Beræans*, and receive or reject them at firſt or afterwards as they ſee cauſe, and this without the leaſt impeachment of the truth or Authority of the Goſpel its ſelf which under this *formal* conſideration as revealed of God, they abſolutely believe. Let us now ſee what you except hereunto. Firſt you ask, *What love of Chriſts dictates, what commiſſion of Chriſt allows you to chooſe and reject at your own pleaſure? Anſ.* None; nor was that at all in queſtion, nor do you ſpeak like a man that durſt look upon the true ſtate of the Controverſie between us. You proclaim your cauſe deſperate by this perpetual tergiverſation. The Queſtion is, whither when men preach the Goſpel unto others, as a Revelation from God, and bring along the *Scripture* with them wherein they ſay that Revelation is comprized, when that is received as ſuch, and hath its authority confirmed in the minds of them that receive it, whither are they not bound to *try* all the teaching in particular of them that firſt bring it unto them, or afterwards continue the preaching of it, whither it be conſonant to that Rule or Word, wherein they believe the whole Revelation of the will of God relating to the Goſpel declared unto them to be contained, and to *embrace* what is *ſuitable* thereunto, and to *reject* any thing that in particular may be by the miſtakes of the teachers impoſed upon them? Inſtead of believing what

what the Scripture teacheth, and rejecting what it condemns, you substitute *choosing or rejecting at your own pleasure*, a thing wherein our discourse is not at all concerned. You adde, *What Heretick was ever so much a fool as not to pretend the Love of Christ, and Commission of Christ for what he did?* What then I pray! may not others do a thing really upon such grounds as some pretend to do them onfalsly? may not a Judge have his Commission from the King, because some have counterfeited the great Seal? May not you sincerely seek the good and peace of your Country upon the Principles of your Religion, though some pretending the same Principles have sought its disturbance and ruine? If there be any force in this exception, it overthrows the Authority and Efficacy of every thing that any man may *falsly pretend* unto, which is to shut out all order, Rule, Government, and vertue out of the world. You proceed, *How shall any one know you do it out of any such Love or Commission, sith those who delivered the Articles of faith now rejected, pretended equal love to Christ and Commission of Christ for the delivery of them as any other!* I wonder you should proceed with such impertinent enquiries. How can any man manifest that he doth any thing by the Commission of another, but by his producing and manifesting his Commission to be his? and how can he prove that he doth it out of *Love* to him, but by his diligence, care, and conscience in the discharge of his Duty, as our Saviour tells us, saying *if you love me, keep my Commandments*, which is the proper effect of love unto him, and open evidence or manifestation of it. Now how should a man prove that he doth any thing by the Commission of Christ, but by *producing that Commission?* that is, in the things about wh ch we treat,

treat, by declaring and evidencing that the things he propoſeth to be believed, are revealed by his ſpirit in his word, and that the things which he *rejects* are contrary thereunto! And what ever men may pretend, Chriſt gives out no adverſe Commiſſions; his word is every way and everywhere the ſame, at perfect harmony and conſiſtency with its ſelf; ſo that if it come to that, that ſeveral Perſons do teach contrary doctrines either before or after one another, or together, under the ſame pretence of receiving them from Chriſt, as was the caſe between the Phariſes of old that believed, and the Apoſtles, they that attend unto them, have a perfect *guide* to direct them in their choice, a perfect *Rule* to judge of the things propoſed. As in the Church of the *Jews* the *Phariſes* had taught the people many things as from God, for their Traditions or *Oral Law* they pretended to be from God: Our *Saviour* comes, really a teacher from God, and he diſproves their *falſe Doctrines* which they had prepoſſeſſed the people withall, and all this he doth by the *Scripture* the Word of Truth which they had before received. And this *Example* hath he left unto his Church unto the end of the world. But you yet proceed; *Why may we not at length reject all the reſt for love of ſomething elſe, when this Love of Chriſt which is now crept into the very out ſide of our lips is ſlipt off from thence! Do you think men cannot find a cavil againſt him as well as his Law delivered unto us with the firſt news of him, and as eaſily dig up the root as cut up the branches!* You are the pleaſanteſt man at a diſputation that ever I met withal, *haud ulli veterum virtute ſecundus*; you outgo your maſters in palpable Sophiſtry. If we may, and ought for the Love of Chriſt, reject errours and untruths taught by fallible men, then we

may

may reject him alſo for the love of other things. Who doubts it, but men *may* if they will, if they have a mind to do ſo? they may do ſo *Phyſically*, but may they do ſo *Morally*? may they do ſo upon the *ſame* or as good grounds and reaſons as they reject *errours* and falſe worſhip for the ſake of Chriſt? With ſuch kind of arguing is the *Roman Cauſe* ſupported. Again, you ſuppoſe the *Law* of Chriſt to be rejected, and therefore ſay that his *Perſon* may be ſo alſo. But this contains an application of the general *Theſis* unto your particular caſe, and thereupon the *begging* of the thing in Queſtion. Our enquiry *was general* Whither things at firſt delivered by any Perſons that preach the Goſpel may not be *rejected* without any impeachment of the Authority of the Goſpel it ſelf? Here, that you may inſinuate that to be the caſe between you and us, you ſuppoſe the things *rejected* to be the *Law* of Chriſt, when indeed they are things rejected becauſe they are *contrary to the Law* of Chriſt, and ſo affirmed in the Aſſertion, which you ſeek to oppoſe. For nothing may be *rejected* by the *Commiſſion* of Chriſt, but what is contrary to his *Law*. The truth is, he that rejects the *Law* of Chriſt as it is his, needs no other inducement to reject his *Perſon*; for he hath done it already in the rejection of his *Law*: but yet it may not be granted, though it belong not unto our preſent diſcourſe, that every one that *rejects* any part of the Law of Chriſt, muſt therefore be in a propenſity to reject Chriſt himſelf, provided that he do it only becauſe he doth not believe it to be any part of his Law. For whileſt a man abides firm and conſtant in his *faith* in Chriſt and love unto him, with a reſolution to ſubmit himſelf to his whole Word, Law, and Inſtitutions, his miſapprehenſions of this or that particular in them, is no

impeachment of his faith, or Love. Of the ſame importance is that which you add, namely, *Did not the Jews by pretence of their love to the immortal God, whom their forefathers ſerved, reject the whole Goſpel at once? and why may not we poſſibly by piece meale?* You do only cavil at the expreſſion I uſed, *of doing the thing* mentioned *for the love of Chriſt*, but I uſed it not alone, as knowing how *eaſie* a thing it was to pretend it, and how *unwarrantable* a ground of any actings in Religion ſuch a pretence would prove; wherefore I added unto it, his *Commiſſion*, that is his Word. And ſo I deſire to know of you whither the Jews *out of love to God and by the direrection of his word* did reject the Goſpel or no. This you muſt aſſert if you intend by this *inſtance* to oppoſe my aſſertion. Beſides indeed the *Jews* did ſcarce pretend to reject the Goſpel out of *love to God*, but to their old Church-State, and Traditions, on which very account your ſelves at this day reject many important truths of it. But it is one thing *vainly* to pretend the Love of God, another *ſo to love* him indeed as to keep his Commandments, and in ſo doing to cleave unto the Truth, and to reject that which is contrary thereunto. You add as the iſſue of theſe enquiries, *Let us leave cavils, grant my ſuppoſition which you cannot deny; then ſpeak to my Conſequence, which I deem moſt ſtrong and good, to infer a Concluſion which neither you nor I can grant.* *Anſw.* I wiſh you had thought before of leaving *Cavils* that we might have been eaſed of the conſideration of the foregoing Queries, which are nothing elſe, and thoſe very trivial. Your ſuppoſition which is, that *Papiſts firſt brought the Goſpel into England*, you ſay I cannot deny: but Sir, I do deny it, and challenge you or any man in the world to make

make it good, or to give any colour of Truth unto it. Then your Conſequence you ſay you *deem ſtrong and good*; I doubt not but you do ſo; ſo did *Suffennus* of his *Poems*, but another was not of the ſame mind who ſays of him,

Qui modo ſcurra
Aut ſi quid hâc re tritius (or hoc re tritius) *videbatur,*
Idem inſiceto eſt inſicetior rure,
Simul poemata attigit, neſ; idem unquam
Æq; eſt beatus ac poema cum ſcribit,
Tam gaudet in ſe, tamque ſe ipſe miratur.

You may for ought I know have a good *faculty* at ſome other things; but you very unhappily pleaſe your ſelf in *drawing of Conſequences*, which for the moſt part are very *infirm* and naught, as in particular I have abundantly manifeſted that to be, which you now ſpeak of. But you conclude; *I tell you plainly and without tergiverſation before God and all his holy Angels what I ſhould think if I deſcended unto any Concluſion in this affair. And it is this, Either the Papiſt who holds at this day all theſe Articles of faith which were delivered at the firſt Converſion of this land by St.* Auſtin, *is unjuſtly become odious amongſt us, or elſe my honeſt Parſons, throw of your Caſſocks, and reſign your benefices and gleablands into the hands of your neighbours whoſe they were afore time. My Conſequence is irrefragable.* And I tell you plainly that I greatly *pitty* you for your diſcourſe, and that on many accounts. Firſt, That in the ſame breath wherein you ſo ſolemnly *proteſt before God and his holy Angels*, you ſhould ſo openly prevaricate, as to intimate that you *deſcend* unto *no concluſions* in this affair, wherein notwithſtanding your pretences you really

really *dogmatize* and that with as much confidence as it is poſſible I think for any man to do. And 2. That you caſt *before God and his holy Angels* the light froth of your ſcoffing expreſſions, *my honeſt Parſons*, &c. a ſign with what conſcience you are converſant in theſe things. And 3. That undertaking to write and declare your mind in things of the nature and importance that theſe are of, you ſhould have no more judgement in them or about them, then ſo ſolemnly to entitle ſuch a *trifling Sophiſm* by the name of *irrefragable Conſequence*. As alſo 4. That in the Solemnity of your Proteſtation you forgot to expreſs your mind *in ſober ſenſe*; for aiming to make a *disjunctive concluſion* you make the *parts* of it not at all *diſparate*, but *coincident* as to your intention, the one of them bring the direct conſequent of the other. 5. That you ſo much make naked your *deſires* after *Benefices and gleab lands*, as though they were the great matter in conteſt amongſt us, which reflects no ſmall *ſhame* and ſtain on Chriſtian Religion and all the Profeſſors of it. 6. Your *Irrefragable Conſequence* is a moſt pittiful piece of Sophiſtry, built upon I know uot how many falſe ſuppoſitions, as 1. That *Papiſts are become odious unto us*, whereas we only reject *your Popery*, love your Perſons, and approve of your Chriſtianity. 2. That *Papiſts brought us the firſt tidings of the Goſpel*, which hath been ſufficiently before diſproved. 3. That *Papiſts hold all things in Religion that they did*, and as they did, who firſt brought us the news of Chriſtianity, which we have alſo manifeſted to be otherwiſe in the *ſignal* inſtance of the opinion of Pope *Gregory* about your Papal Power and titles. 4. That we have no occaſion of exception againſt *Papiſts*, but only their holding the things that thoſe did

did, who firſt preached the Goſpel here; when that is no *cauſe* at all of our exceptions, but their multitude of pretended *Articles of faith*, and idolatrous ſuperſtitious practiſes in worſhip, ſuperadded by them ſince that time, are the things they ſtand charged withall. Now your Conſequent being built on all theſe ſuppoſitions, fit to hold a principal place in *Lucians vera hiſtoria*, muſt needs be *irrefragable*.

What you add farther on this *ſubject*, is but a repetition in other words of what you had ſaid before, with an application of your *falſe* and groundleſs ſuppoſition unto our preſent differences: but yet leaſt you ſhould flatter your ſelf, or your Diſciples deceive themſelves with thoughts that there is any thing of weight or *moment* in it, it ſhall alſo be conſidered. You adde then, *that if any part, much more if any parts, great ſubſtantial parts of Religion brought into the Land with the firſt news of Chriſtianity be once rejected (as they are now amongſt us) as Romiſh or Romanical, and that rejection or Reformation be permitted, then may other parts and all parts, if the gap be not ſtopped, be looked upon at length as points of no better a condition.*

I have given you ſundry inſtances already, undeniably evincing that ſome opinions of them who firſt bring the *news* of Chriſtian Religion unto any, may be afterwards rejected without the leaſt impeachment of the *Truth* of the whole, or of our faith therein. Yea men may be neceſſitated ſo to reject them, to keep entire the Truth of the *whole*. But the rejection ſuppoſed, is of *mens* opinions that bring Chriſtian Religion, and not of any *parts* of Chriſtian Religion it ſelf. For the *miſtakes* of any men whatever, whither in Speculation or Practice about Religion, are no *parts* of Religion, much leſs *ſubſtantial*

parts of it. Such was the Opinion of the neceſſity of the obſervation of *Moſaical* Rites taught with a ſuitable practice, by many believers of the *Circumciſion*, who firſt preached the Goſpel in ſundry places in the world. And ſuch were the Rites and Opinions brought into *England* by *Auſtin* that are rejected by *Proteſtants*, if any ſuch there were, which as yet you have not made to appear. There is no ſuch *affinity* between Truth and Errour, however any men may endeavour to blend them together, but that others may ſeparate between them, and reject the one without any prejudice unto the other; *male ſarta gratia nequaquam coit.* Yea the *Truth* and Light of the Goſpel is of that nature, as that if it be once ſincerely received in the mind and embraced, it will *work out* all thoſe falſe notions, which by any means together with it may be inſtilled: As *rectum* is *index ſui & obliqui.* Whileſt then we know and are perſwaded that in any *Syſteme* of Religion which is propoſed unto us, it is only *error* which we reject, having an infallible *Rule* for the guidance of our judgement therein, there is no danger of weakning our aſſent unto the Truth which we retain. Truth and falſhood can never ſtand upon the ſame *bottom*, nor have the ſame evidence, though they may be propoſed at the ſame *time* unto us, and by the ſame *Perſons.* So that there is no difficulty in apprehending how the one may be *received*, and the other *rejected.* Nor may it be granted (though their concernment lye not therein at all) that if a man reject or *disbelieve* any point of Truth that is delivered unto him in an entire *Syſteme* of Truths, that he is thereby made enclinable to reject the reſt alſo, or diſenabled to give a *firm aſſent* unto them, unleſs he reject or disbelieve it upon a notion that is common to

them

them all. For inſtance; He that rejects *any Truth* revealed in the Scripture on this ground, that the Scripture is not an *infallible* Revelation of Divine and ſupernatural Truth, cannot but in the perſuit of that *apprehenſion* of his, reject alſo all other Truths therein revealed, at leaſt ſo far as they are knowable only by that Revelation. But he that ſhall disbelieve any Truth revealed in the Scripture, becauſe it is not *manifeſt* unto him to be ſo revealed, and is in a readineſs to receive it when it ſhall be ſo *manifeſt*, upon the Authority of the Author of the whole, is not in the leaſt danger to be induced by that *disbelief* to queſtion any thing of that which he is convinced ſo to be revealed. But as I ſaid, your *Concernment* lyes not therein, who are not able to prove that *Proteſtants* have rejected any one part, much leſs *ſubſtantial part* of Religion; and your concluſion upon a ſuppoſition of the rejection of errours and practiſes of the contrary to the Goſpel or principles of Religion, is very infirm. The ground of all your *Sophiſtry* lyes in this, that men who receive Chriſtian Religion, are bound to reſolve their faith into the *Authority* of them that preach it firſt unto them: whereupon it being impoſſible for them to queſtion any thing they teach without an impeachment of *their abſolute Infallibility*, and ſo far the Authority which they are to reſt upon, they have no firm foundation left for their aſſent unto the things which as yet they do not queſtion, and conſequently in proceſs of time may eaſily be induced ſo to do. But this *preſumption* is perfectly deſtructive to all the certainty of Chriſtian Religion. For whereas it propoſeth the *ſubject matter* of it to be believed with divine faith and ſupernatural, it leaves no *formal reaſon* or cauſe of any ſuch faith, no foundation for it to be

parts of it. Such was the Opinion of the neceſſity of the obſervation of *Moſaical* Rites taught with a ſuitable practice, by many believers of the *Circumciſion*, who firſt preached the Goſpel in ſundry places in the world. And ſuch were the Rites and Opinions brought into *England* by *Auſtin* that are rejected by *Proteſtants*, if any ſuch there were, which as yet you have not made to appear. There is no ſuch *affinity* between Truth and Errour, however any men may endeavour to blend them together, but that others may ſeparate between them, and reject the one without any prejudice unto the other; *male ſarta gratia nequaquam coit.* Yea the *Truth* and Light of the Goſpel is of that nature, as that if it be once ſincerely received in the mind and embraced, it will *work out* all thoſe falſe notions, which by any means together with it may be inſtilled: As *rectum* is *index ſui & obliqui.* Whileſt then we know and are perſwaded that in any *Syſteme* of Religion which is propoſed unto us, it is only *error* which we reject, having an infallible *Rule* for the guidance of our judgement therein, there is no danger of weakning our aſſent unto the Truth which we retain. Truth and falſhood can never ſtand upon the ſame *bottom*, nor have the ſame evidence, though they may be propoſed at the ſame *time* unto us, and by the ſame *Perſons.* So that there is no difficulty in apprehending how the one may be *received*, and the other *rejected.* Nor may it be granted (though their concernment lye not therein at all) that if a man reject or *disbelieve* any point of Truth that is delivered unto him in an entire *Syſteme* of Truths, that he is thereby made enclinable to reject the reſt alſo, or diſenabled to give a *firm aſſent* unto them, unleſs he reject or disbelieve it upon a notion that is common to

them

them all. For inſtance; He that rejects *any Truth* revealed in the Scripture on this ground, that the Scripture is not an *infallible* Revelation of Divine and ſupernatural Truth, cannot but in the perſuit of that *apprehenſion* of his, reject alſo all other Truths therein revealed, at leaſt ſo far as they are knowable only by that Revelation. But he that ſhall disbelieve any Truth revealed in the Scripture, becauſe it is not *manifeſt* unto him to be ſo revealed, and is in a readineſs to receive it when it ſhall be ſo *manifeſt*, upon the Authority of the Author of the whole, is not in the leaſt danger to be induced by that *disbelief* to queſtion any thing of that which he is convinced ſo to be revealed. But as I ſaid, your *Concernment* lyes not therein, who are not able to prove that *Proteſtants* have rejected any one part, much leſs *ſubſtantial part* of Religion; and your concluſion upon a ſuppoſition of the rejection of errours and practiſes of the contrary to the Goſpel or principles of Religion, is very infirm. The ground of all your *Sophiſtry* lyes in this, that men who receive Chriſtian Religion, are bound to reſolve their faith into the *Authority* of them that preach it firſt unto them: whereupon it being impoſſible for them to queſtion any thing they teach without an impeachment of *their abſolute Infallibility*, and ſo far the Authority which they are to reſt upon, they have no firm foundation left for their aſſent unto the things which as yet they do not queſtion, and conſequently in proceſs of time may eaſily be induced ſo to do. But this *preſumption* is perfectly deſtructive to all the certainty of Chriſtian Religion. For whereas it propoſeth the *ſubject matter* of it to be believed with divine faith and ſupernatural, it leaves no *formal reaſon* or cauſe of any ſuch faith, no foundation for it to be

built upon, or Principle to be reſolved into. For how can Divine faith ariſe out of humane Authority! For acts being *ſpecificated* by their objects, ſuch as is the *Authority* on which a man believes, ſuch is his *faith*, humane if that be humane, divine if it be divine. But reſolving as we ought all our faith into the *Authority* of God revealing things to be believed, and knowing that Revelation to be *entirely* contained in the Scriptures, by which we are to examine and *try* whatever is by any man or men propoſed unto us as an object of our faith, they propoſing it only upon this conſideration that it is a part of that which is revealed by God in the Scripture for us to believe, without which they have no ground nor warrant to *propoſe* any thing at all unto us in that kind, we may reject any of their *propoſals* which we find and diſcern not to be ſo revealed, or not to be agreeable to what is ſo revealed, without the leaſt *weakning* of our aſſent unto what is revealed indeed, or making way for any man ſo to do. For whileſt the *formal reaſon* of faith remains abſolutely unimpeached, different apprehenſions about particular things to be believed, have no efficacy to *weaken* faith its ſelf, as we ſhall farther ſee in the examination of your enſuing Diſcourſe.

The ſame way and means that lopt off ſome branches, will do the like to others, and root too: (but the errours and miſtakes of men are not branches growing from the root of the Goſpel) *A Vilification of that Church wherein they find themſelves who have a mind to prevaricate upon pretence of Scripture and power of interpreting it, light, ſpirit or reaſon, adjoyned with a perſonal obſtinacy that will not ſubmit, will do it roundly and to effect. This firſt brought off the Proteſtants from the Roman Catholick Church;*

this

this lately ſeparated the Presbyterians from the Engliſh Proteſtant Church, the Independent from the Presbyterian, and the Quakers from the other Independent. And this left good, maintains nothing of Chriſtian Religion but the moral part, which indeed and truth is but honeſt Paganiſm. This ſpeech is worthy of all ſerious Conſideration.

That which this *Diſcourſe* ſeems to amount unto, is that if a man queſtion or reject *any thing* that is taught by the Church whereof he is a member, there remains no way for him to come unto any *certainty* in the remaining parts of Religion, but that he may on as good grounds queſtion and reject all things as any. As you phraſe the matter, by *mens vilifying a Church which a mind to prevaricate upon pretence of Scripture*, &c. though there is no conſequence in what you ſay, yet no man can be ſo mad as to plead in juſtification of ſuch a proceeding. For it is not much to be doubted, but that he who layeth *ſuch a foundation*, and makes ſuch a beginning of a *ſeparation* from any Church, will make a progreſs ſuitable thereunto. But if you will ſpeak unto your own *purpoſe*, and ſo as they may have any concernment in what you ſay with whom you deal, you muſt otherwiſe frame your *hypotheſis*. Suppoſe a man to be a member of any Church, or to find himſelf in any Church ſtate with others, and that he doth at any time by the *light* and direction of the Scripture, diſcover any thing or things to be *taught* or *practiſed* in that Church whereof he is ſo a member, which he cannot aſſent unto, unleſs he will contradict the *Revelation* that God hath made of himſelf, his mind and will, in that compleat Rule of all that Religion and worſhip which are pleaſing unto him, and therefore doth *ſuſpend* his aſſent thereunto, and therein

diſſent

diſſent from the determination of that Church; then you are to aſſert for the promotion of your deſign, that all the Conſequents will follow which you expatiate upon. But this ſuppoſition fixes immoveably upon the penalty of forfeiting their *intereſt* in all ſaving truth, all Chriſtians whatever, *Greeks*, *Abiſſines*, *Armenians*, *Proteſtants* in the Churches wherein they find themſelves, and ſo makes fruſtrate all their attempts for their reconciliation to the Church of *Rome*. For do you think they will attend unto you, when you perſwade them to a relinquiſhment of the Communion of that Church wherein they *find themſelves* to joyn with you, when the firſt thing you tell them is, that if they do ſo, they are *undone* and that for ever? And yet this is the ſumm of all that you can plead with them, if there be any *ſenſe* in the Argument you make uſe of againſt our relinquiſhment of the opinions and practiſes of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe we or our forefathers were at any time members thereof, or lived in its communion. But you would have this the ſpecial Priviledge of your Church alone. Any *other* Church a man may leave, yea *all other* Churches beſides; he may relinquiſh the principles wherein he hath been inſtructed, yea it is his duty to renounce their Communion; only your Church *of Rome* is wholly ſacred; a man that hath *once* been a member of it muſt be ſo for *ever*; and he that queſtions *any thing* taught therein, may on the ſame grounds queſtion *all* the Articles of faith in the Chriſtian Religion. And who gave you leave to *ſuppoſe* the only thing in *Queſtion* between us, and to uſe it as a *medium* to educe your Concluſion from? is it your buſineſs to take care,

Bullatis

bullatis ut tibi nugis
Pagina turgeſcat, dare pondus idonea fumo?

We know the condition of your Roman Church to be no other then that of *other* Churches, if it be not worſe then that of *any* of them. And therefore on what terms and reaſons ſoever, a man may relinquiſh the opinions and renounce the Communion of *any* other Church, upon the ſame may he renounce the Communion and relinquiſh the Opinions of *yours*. And if there be no reaſons ſufficiently cogent ſo to deal with any Church whatever, I pray on what grounds do you proceed to perſwade others to ſuch a Courſe, that they may joyn with you?

——Diciſq; faciſq; quod ipſe
Non Sani eſſe hominis non ſanus juret Oreſtes.

To diſintangle you out of this *Labyrinth* whereinto you have caſt your ſelf, I ſhall deſire you to obſerve, that if the Lord Chriſt by his Word be the *Supream Revealer* of all Divine Truth; and the Church, that is any Church whatever, be only the *Miniſterial propoſer* of it, under and from him, being to be regulated in all its propoſitions by his Revelation, if it ſhall chance to *propoſe* that for Truth, which is not by him revealed, as it may do, ſeeing it hath no ſecurity of being preſerved from ſuch *failures*, but only in its attendance unto that *Rule*, which it may neglect or corrupt: A man in ſuch a Caſe cannot diſcharge his Duty to the *Supream Revealer*, without diſſenting from the *Miniſterial propoſer*. Nay if it be a *Truth* which is propoſed, and a man diſſent from it, becauſe he is not convinced that it is *revealed*, he is in no danger to be induced to queſtion other

Pro-

Propositions, which he knows to be ſo revealed, his faith being built upon, and reſolved into that Revelation alone. All that remains of your diſcourſe lyes with its whole weight on this *preſumption*, becauſe ſome men may either *wilfully* prevaricate from the Truth, or be *miſtaken* in their apprehenſions of it, and ſo diffent from a Church *that teacheth* the truth, and *wherein* ſhe ſo teacheth it, without cauſe; therefore no man may or ought to relinquiſh the *errors* of a Church, which he is really and truly convinced by Scripture and ſolid reaſon ſuitable thereunto, ſo to be. An inference ſo wild and ſo deſtructive of all *aſſurance* in every thing that is *knowable* in the world, that I wonder how your *Intereſt* could induce you to give any countenance unto it. For if no man can certainly and *infallibly* know any thing by any way or means wherein ſome or other are *ignorantly* or *wilfully* miſtaken, we muſt bid *adiew* for ever to the certain knowledge of any thing in this world. And how ſlightly ſoever you are pleaſed to ſpeak of *Scripture Light*, *Spirit* and *Reaſon*, they are the proper names of the wayes and *helps* that God hath graciouſly given to the ſons of men, to come to the knowledge of himſelf. And if the *Scripture* by the aſſiſtance of the *Spirit* of God, and the *light* into it communicated unto men by him, be not ſufficient to lead them in the uſe and improvement of their *Reaſon* unto the ſaving knowledge of the will of God, and that *aſſurance* therein which may be a firm foundation of acceptable obedience unto him, they muſt be content to go without it; for other wayes and means of it, there are none. But this is your manner of dealing with us. All other Churches muſt be ſleighted and *relinquiſhed*, the means appointed and ſanctified by God himſelf to bring us unto the know-

knowledge of, and ſettlement in the Truth muſt be *rejected*, that all men may be brought to a *fanatical* unreaſonable reſignation of their faith to you and your Church; if this be not done, men may with as *good reaſon* renounce Truth as Error; and after they have rejected one error, be inclined to caſt off all that Truth, for the ſake whereof that error was rejected by them. And I know not what other inconveniences and miſchiefs will follow: It muſt needs be well for you, that you are

——— *Gallinæ filius albæ,*

Seeing all others are

——— *Viles pulli nati infelicibus ovis.*

Your only miſadventure is, that you are fallen into ſomewhat an unhappy age, wherein men are hard-hearted, and will not give away their *Faith* and *Reaſon* to every one that can take the confidence to beg them at their hands.

But you will now prove by *inſtances*, that if a man deny any thing that your Church propoſeth, he may with as good reaſon deny every Truth whatever. I ſhall follow you through them, and conſider what in your *matter* or manner of propoſal is worthy that ſerious peruſal of them which you ſo much deſire. To begin, *See if the Quakers deny not as reſolutely the regenerating power of Baptiſme, as you the efficacy of Abſolution. See if the Presbyterians do not with as much reaſon evacuate the Prelacy of Proteſtants, as they the Papacy.* All things it ſeems are alike, Truth and Error, and may with the ſame reaſon be oppoſed and rejected. And becauſe ſome men renounce *errors*, others may on as good grounds renounce the Truth, and oppoſe it with as ſolid and cogent

cogent reaſons. The *Scripture* it ſeems is of no uſe to direct, guide, or ſettle men in theſe things that relate to the worſhip and knowledge of God. What a ſtrange *dream* hath the Church of God been in from the dayes of *Moſes*, if this be ſo! Hitherto it hath been thought that what the *Scripture* teacheth in theſe things turned the *ſcales*, and made the embracement of it reaſonable, as the rejection of them the contrary. As the *woman* ſaid to *Joab*, *They were wont to ſpeak in old time, ſaying, they ſhall ſurely aſk counſel at* Abel, *and ſo they ended the matter:* They ſaid in old time concerning theſe things, To the *Law and the Teſtimonies*, ſearch the Scriptures, and ſo they ended the matter. But it ſeems *tempora mutantur*, and that now Truth and Falſehood are equally probable, having the ſame grounds, the ſame evidences. *Quis leget hæc, min, tu iſtud ais.* Do you think to be believed in theſe incredible figments, fit to bear a part in the ſtories of *Ulyſſes* unto *Alcinous*! Yet you proceed, *See if the Socinian Arguments againſt the Trinity, be not as ſtrong as yours againſt the Euchariſt.* But where did you ever read any Arguments of ours againſt the *Euchariſt*? Have you a diſpenſation to ſay what you pleaſe for the promotion of the Catholick Cauſe? Are not the Arguments you intend, indeed rather *for* the Euchariſt then *againſt* it? Arguments to vindicate the nature of that holy *Euchariſtical* Ordinance, and to preſerve it from the manifold abuſes that you and your Church do put upon it. That is, they are arguments againſt your *Tranſubſtantiation* and *proper ſacrifice* that you intend. And will you now ſay, that the Arguments of the *Socinians* againſt the *Trinity*, the great fundamental Article of our Profeſſion plainly *taught* in the Scripture, and *conſtantly believed*

lieved by the Church of all Ages, are of equal force and validity, with thoſe uſed againſt your *Tranſubſtantiation*, and *Sacrifice of the Maſs*, things never mentioned, no not once in the whole Scripture, never heard of, nor believed by the Church of old, and deſtructive in your reception unto all that reaſon and ſenſe, whereby we are, and know that we are men and live? But ſuppoſe your prejudice and partial addiction unto your way and faction, may be allowed to countenance you in this monſtrous comparing and coupling of things together like his, who

Mortua jungebat corpora vivis;

is your inference from your enquiry any other but this, that the Scripture ſetting aſide the Authority of your Church, is of no uſe to inſtruct men in the Truth, but that all things are alike uncertain unto all! And this you farther manifeſt to be your meaning in your following enquiries. *See* ſay you, *if the Jew do not with as much plauſibility deride Chriſt, as you his Church.* And would you could ſee what it is to be a *zealot* in a faction, or would learn to deal candidly and honeſtly in things wherein your own and the ſouls of other men are concerned. Who is it amongſt us that *derides* the Church of Chriſt? Did *Elijah* deride the *Temple* at *Jeruſalem*, when he oppoſed the *Prieſts of Baal*? or muſt every one preſently be judged to *deride the Church of Chriſt*, who oppoſeth the corruptions that the *Roman faction* have endeavoured to bring into that *part* of it, wherein for ſome ages they have prevailed? What *Plauſibility* you have found out in the *Jews deriſion* of Chriſt, I know not. I know ſome that are as converſant in their writings at leaſt, as you ſeem to have

have been, who affirm that your arguings and revilings are utterly deſtitute of all *plauſibility* and tolerable pretence. But men muſt have leave to ſay what they pleaſe, when they will be *talking* of they know not what; as is the caſe with you, when by any chance you ſtumble on the *Jews* or their concernments. This is that which for the preſent you would perſwade men unto; That the Arguments of the *Jews* againſt Chriſt, are as good as thoſe of *Proteſtants* againſt your Church, *credat Apella*. Of the ſame nature with theſe is the remainder of your Inſtances and Queries. You ſuppoſe that a man may have as good reaſons for the denyal of *Hell*, as *Purgatory*; of *Gods Providence* and the Souls Immortality, as of any *piece of Popery*; and *then may not want appearing incongruities, tautologies, improbabilities to diſenable all Holy Writ at once.* This is the condition of the man who disbelieves any thing propoſed by your Church, nor in that ſtate is he capable of any relief. Fluctuate he muſt in all *uncertainties:* Truth and error are all one unto him; and he hath as good grounds for the one as the other. But Sir, pray what ſerves the *Scripture* for all this while? Will it afford a man no Light, no Guidance, no Direction? Was this quite out of your mind? or did you preſume your *Reader* would not once caſt his thoughts towards it for his relief in that maze of *uncertainties* which yon endeavour to caſt him into? or dare you manage ſuch an *impeachment* of the wiſdom and goodneſs of God, as to affirm that that Revelation of himſelf which he hath graciouſly afforded unto men to teach them the knowledge of himſelf, and to bring them to ſettlement and aſſurance therein, is of no uſe or validity to any ſuch purpoſe? The Holy Ghoſt tells

us,

us, that *the Scripture is profitable for doctrine and instruction, able to make the man of God perfect, and us all wise unto salvation, that the sure Word of Prophecy, whereunto he commands us to attend is a light shining in a dark place*; directs us to *search into it*, that we may come to the acknowledgement of the Truth; sending us unto it for our *settlement*, affirming that they who speak not according *to the Law and the Testimonies* have no light in them. He assures us that the *word of God* is a light unto our feet, and his Law *perfect*, converting the soul: That it is able *to build us up, and to give us an inheritance among all them that are sanctified*: that the things in it are written *that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing we may have life through his name*. See also *Luke* 16. 29, 31. *Psal.* 19. 18. 2 *Pet.* 1 19. *John* 5: 39. *Rom.* 15. 4. *Heb.* 4 12. Is there no truth in all this, and much more that is affirmed to the same purpose? or are you surprized with this mention of it, as *Cæsar Borgia* was with his sickness at the death of his father *Pope Alexander*, which spoiled all his designs, and made him cry, that he had never thought of it, and so had not provided against it. Do you not know that a *volume* might be filled with Testimonies of antient fathers, bearing witness to the *sufficiency* and *efficacy* of the Scripture for the settlement of the minds of men in the knowledge of God and his worship? Doth not the experience of all Ages, of all places in the world render your *Sophistry* contemptible? are there not, were there not *millions* of Christians always, who either knew not, or regarded not, or openly rejected the Authority of your Church, and disbelieved many of her present proposals, who yet were, and are *stedfast* and immoveable

able in the faith of Christ, and willingly seal the Truth of it with their dearest blood? But if neither the *Testimony* of God himself in the Scriptures, nor the concurrent *suffrage* of the antient Church, nor the experience of so many thousands of the Disciples of Christ, is of any moment with you, I hope you will not take it amiss if I look upon you as one giving in your self as *signal an Instance* of the power of prejudice, and partial addiction to a party and interest, as a man can well meet withall in the world. This discourse you tell me in your close, you have bestowed upon me in a way of *supererogation*, wherein you deal with us as you do with God himself. The *Duties* he expressly by his commands requireth at your hands; you *pass by* without so much as takeing notice of some of them; and others, as those of the *second Command* you openly reject, offering him somewhat of your own that he doth not require, by the way, as *you barbarously call* it of *Supererogation*; and so here you have passed over in *silence* that which was incumbent on you to have replyed unto, if you had not a mind *vadimonium desrere*, to give over the defence of that Cause you had undertaken; and in the room thereof substitute this *needless* and *useless diversion*, by the way as you say of *Supererogation*. But yet because you were so free of your *Charity*, before you had *payed your debts*, as to bestow it upon me, I was not unwilling to requite your kindness, and have therefore *sent it you back again*, with that acknowledgement of your favour wherewith it is now attended.

CHAP.

CHAP. 13.

Faith and Charity of Roman Catholicks.

YOur following Diſcourſe *pag.* 44, 45. is ſpent partly in the *Commendation* of your *Fiat Lux*, and the *Metaphyſical* abſtracted diſcourſes of it; partly in a repetition in other words of what you had before inſiſted on. The former I ſhall no further endeavour to diſturb your contentment in. It is a common error

——*Neq; eſt quiſquam*
Quem non in aliqua re videre Suffenum
Poſſis.

I am not your *Rivall* in the admiration of it, and ſhall therefore leave you quietly in the *embracements* of your Darling. And for the latter, we have had enough of it already, and ſo by this time I hope you think alſo. The cloſe only of your Diſcourſe *is conſiderable*, and therefore I ſhall tranſcribe it for your ſecond thoughts. And it is this,

But Sir what you ſay here, and ſo often up and down your book of Papiſts contempt of the Scripture, I beſeech you will pleaſe to abſtain from it for the time to come. I have converſed with the Roman Catholicks of France, Flanders *and* Germany; *I have read more of your Books both Hiſtories, Contemplative and Scholaſtical Divines, then I believe you have ever ſeen or heard of. I have ſeen the Colledges of Sacred Prieſts and Religious houſes, I have communed with all ſort of people, and peruſed their Counſells. And after all this I tell you, and out of my love I tell you that their reſpect to Scripture is*

real, absolute and cordial, even to admiration. Others may talk of it, but they act it, and would be ready to stone that man that should diminish Holy Writ. Let us not wrong the innocent. The Scripture is theirs, and Jesus Christ is theirs, who also will plead their Cause when he sees time.

What you mention of your own *diligence* and atchievements, what you have *done*, where you have *been*, what you have seen and discoursed, I shall not trouble you about. It may be as to your souls health

——*Tutior, peteras esse domi.*

But yet for all the report that you are pleased to make of *your self*, it is not hard to discern that you and I

——*Nec pondera rerum*
Nec momenta sumus.

And notwithstanding your Writings, it would have been very difficult for any man to have guessed at your *great reading*, had you not satisfied us by this your own information of it. It may be if you had spared some of the *time* which you have spent in the reading of your *Catholick Books* unto the study of the *Scripture*, it had not been unto your disadvantage. In the mean time there is an *Hyperbole* in your confidence a little too evident. For it is possible that *I may*, and true that I have *seen more of your Authors* in *half* an *hour*, then you can read I think in *an hundred years*; unless you intend alwayes to give no other account of your reading, then you have done in your *Fiat* and *Epistola*: But we are weary of this περιαυτολογία,

Quin

Quin tu alium quæras quoi centones farcias.

But to paſs by this *boaſting*, there are two parts of your Diſcourſe, the one concerning the *faith*, the other expreſſing the *Charity* of Roman Catholicks. The firſt contains what *reſpect* you would be thought to *have for the Scripture*, the latter what you really have for all *other Chriſtians beſides* your ſelves. As to the former you tell me, that I ſpeak of the *Papiſts contempt of the Scripture, and deſire me to abſtain from it for the time to come.* Whither I have uſed that expreſſion anywhere of *contempt* of the Scripture, well I know not. But whereas I look upon you as my *friend*, at leaſt for the *good advice* I have frequently given you, I have deſerved that you ſhould be ſo, and therefore ſhall not deny you any thing that I can *reaſonably grant*; and whereas I cannot readily comply with you in your *preſent requeſt*, as to the alteration of my mind in reference unto the *reſpect* that *Papiſts* bear unto the Scriptures, I eſteem my ſelf *obliged* to give you ſome account of the reaſons why I perſiſt in my former thoughts, which I hope, as is uſual in ſuch caſes, you will be pleaſed to take in friendly part. For beſides Sir, that you back your *requeſt* with nothing but ſome overconfident *aſſeverations*, ſubſcribed with *teſte meipſo*, I have many reaſons taken from the *practice* and Doctrine of your Church, that ſtrongly induce me to abide in my former perſwaſion. As 1. You know that in theſe and the neighbouring Nations, Papiſts have *publickly burned* the Scriptures, and deſtroyed more Copies of them then ever *Antiochus Epiphanes* did of the *Jewiſh Law*. And if you ſhould go about to prove unto me that Proteſtants have no great regard to *Sacred Images that*

have been worſhipped, becauſe in theſe and the neighbouring Nations they brake and burned a great number of them, I ſhould not readily know what to anſwer you. Nor can I entertain any ſuch confidence of your abilities, as to expect from you a ſatisfactory *anſwer* unto my inſtance of the very ſame nature, manifeſting what reſpect *Papiſts* bear unto the Scriptures. 2. You know that they have *impriſoned* and *burned* ſundry perſons for keeping the Scripture in their houſes, or ſome parts of them, and reading them for their inſtruction and comfort. Nor is this any *great ſign* of reſpect unto them, no more then it is of mens reſpect to *treaſon* or *murder*, becauſe they hang them up who are guilty of them. And 3. Your Church *prohibiteth the reading of them* unto Lay-men, unleſs in ſome ſpecial caſes, ſome few of them be licenced by you ſo to do, and you ſtudy & ſweat for arguments to prove the reading of them needleſs and dangerous, putting them as tranſlated, into the *Catalogue* of Books prohibited. Now this is the very mark and ſtamp that your *Church* ſets upon theſe books which ſhe diſapproves, and diſcountenanceth as pernicious to the faithful. 4. Your *Councel of Trent* hath decreed that your *unwritten Traditions* are to be received with the ſame *faith and veneration* as the Scripture, conſtituting them to be one part of the Word of God, and the Scriptures another, then which nothing could be ſpoken more in *contempt* of it, or in reproach unto it. For I muſt aſſure you, *Proteſtants* think you cannot poſſibly contract a greater guilt by any contempt of the Scripture then you do, by reducing it into order with your *unwritten Traditions*. 5. You have *added Books* not only written with an *humane and fallible Spirit*, but farced with *actual miſtakes* and falſhoods

falſhoods unto the Canon of the Scripture, giving juſt occaſion unto them who receive it from you only, to queſtion the Authority of the whole. And 6. You teach the *Authority* of the Scripture at leaſt in reſpect of us, (which is all it hath, for Authority is ἐν τῷ πρὸς τι, and muſt regard ſome in relation unto whom it doth conſiſt) depends on the *Authority* of your Church; the readieſt way in the world to bring it into *Contempt* with them that know what your Church is, and what it hath been. And 7. *You plead that it is very obſcure and unintelligible* of its ſelf, and that in things of the greateſt moment, and of moſt indiſpenſible neceſſity unto Salvation; whereby you render it perfectly *uſeleſs*, according to the old Rule, *Quod non poteſt intelligi, debet negligi*; it is fit *that ſhould be neglected, which cannot be underſtood.* And 8. There is a book lately written by one of your party, after you have been frequently warned and told of theſe things, entituled *Fiat Lux*, giving countenance unto many other hard reflections upon it, as hath been manifeſted in the *Animadverſions* written on that Book. 9. Your great *Maſters* in their writings have ſpoken very *contemptuouſly* of it: whereof I ſhall give you a few inſtances. The Council of *Trent* which is properly *yours*, determines as I told you, that their Traditions are to be received and venerated *pari pietatis affectu & reverentia*, with *an equal affection of piety and reverence*, as the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament: which is a ſetting up of the *Altar of Damaſcus* with that of God himſelf in the ſame Temple. *Seſſ.* 4. *Dec.* 1. And *Andradius*, no ſmall part of that Convention, in his defence of that *Decree* tells us that, *cum Chriſtus fragilitati memoriæ Evangelio ſcripto ſuccurrendum putavit, ita breve com-*

pendium libris tradi voluit, ut pars maxima tanquam magni precii theſaurus traditionibus intimis Eccleſiæ viſceribus infixis relicta fuerit. As our Lord Chriſt thought meet to relieve the frailty of memory by the written Goſpel, ſo he would have a ſhort compendium or abridgement committed unto books, that the greateſt part as a moſt precious treaſure might be left unto Traditions fixed in the very inward bowels of the Church. This is that *cordial and abſolute reſpect* even *unto admiration* that your Catholicks bear unto the Scripture: And he that doth not *admire it*, ſeems to me to be very ſtupid. It contains ſome *ſmall part* of the myſteries of Chriſtian Religion, the *great treaſure* of them lying in your *Traditions*; and thereupon he concludes, *Canonem ſeu Regulam fidei exactiſſimam non eſſe Scripturam, ſed Eccleſiæ judicium; that the Canon or moſt exact Rule of Faith is not the Scripture but the judgement of the Church*; Much to the ſame purpoſe as you plead in your *Fiat* and *Epiſtola*. *Pighius* another Champion of your Church, *Eccleſiaſt. Hierarch. Lib.* 1. *c.* 4. after he hath given many reaſons to prove the obſcurity of the Scripture, with its flexibility to every mans ſenſe, as you know who alſo hath done, and referred all things to be determined by the Church, concludes, *Si hujus Doctrinæ memores fuiſſemus, hæreticos ſcilicet non eſſe informandos, vel convincendos ex Scripturis, meliore ſane loco eſſent res noſtræ; ſed dum oſtentandi ingenii & eruditionis gratia cum* Luthero *in certamen diſcenditur Scripturarum, excitatum eſt hoc quod, proh dolor, nunc videmus incendium. Had we been mindful of this Doctrine, that Hereticks are not to be inſtructed, nor convinced out of the Scriptures, our affairs had been in a better condition then now they are: but whileſt ſome to ſhew*

their

their wit and learning would needs contend with Luther *out of the Scriptures, the fire which we now with grief behold, was kindled and ſtirred up.* And it may be you remember who it was that called the Scripture *Evangelium nigrum*, and *Theologiam atramentariam*, ſeeing he was one of the moſt famous champions of your Church and Cauſe. But before we quite leave your *Council of Trent*, we may do well to remember the advice which the *Fathers* of it, who upon the ſtirs in *Germany* removed unto *Bononia*, gave to the *Pope*, *Julius* the third, which one that was then amongſt them afterwards publiſhed. *Deniq*; ſay they in their letters to him, *quod inter omnia conſilia quæ nos hoc tempore dare poſſumus omnium graviſſimum ad extremum reſervavimus. Oculi hic aperiendi ſunt, omnibus nervis adnitendum erit ut quam minimum Evangelii poterit (præſertim vulgari lingua) in iis legatur Civitatibus, quæ ſub tua ditione & poteſtate ſunt, ſufficiatq; tantillum illud quod in miſſa legi ſolet, nec eo amplius cuiquam mortalium legere liceat. Quam diu enim pauculo illo homines contenti fuerunt, tam diu res tuæ ex ſententia ſucceſſêre, eædemq, in contrarium labi cæperunt ex quo ulterius legi vulgo uſurpatum eſt. Hic ille (in ſumma) Eſt liber qui præter cæteros haſce nobis tempeſtates ac turbines conciliavit quibus prope abrepti ſumus. Et ſane ſiquis illum diligenter expendat, deinde quæ in noſtris fieri eccleſiis conſueverunt, ſingula ordine contemplatur, videbis plurimum inter ſe diſſidere, & hanc doctrinam noſtram ab illa prorſus diverſam eſſe ac ſæpe contrariam etiam. Quod ſimul atq; homines intelligant, à docto ſcilicet aliquo adverſariorum ſtimulati, non ante clamandi finem faciunt, quam rem plane omnem divulgaverint, noſq; inviſos omnibus reddiderint. Quare occultandæ pauculæ illæ chartulæ ſed abhibita*

quadam

quadam cautione & diligentia, ne ea res majores nobis turbas ac tumultus excitet. Last of all, that which is the most weighty of all the advices which at this time we shall give unto you, we have reserved for the close of all. Your eyes are here to be opened; you are to endeavour with the utmost of your power, that as little as may be of the Gospel (especially in any vulgar tongue) be read in those Cities which are under your government and Authority; but let that little suffice them which is wont to be read in the Mass (of which mind you also know who is *) neither let it be lawful for any man to read any more of it. For as long as men were contented with that little, your affairs were as prosperous as heart could desire, and began immediately to decline upon the custome of reading any more of it. This is in brief that book which above all others hath procured unto us those tempests and storms wherewith we are almost carryed away headlong. And the Truth is, if any one shall diligently consider it, and then seriously ponder on all the things that are accustomed to be done in our Churches, he will find them to be very different the one from the other, and our Doctrine to be divers from the Doctrine thereof, yea and oftentimes plainly contrary unto it. Now this when men begin to understand, being stirred up by some learned man or other amongst the adversaries, they make no end of clamouring until they have divulged the whole matter, and rendred us hateful unto all. Wherefore those few sheets of Paper are to be hid but with caution and diligence, least their concealment should stir us up greater troubles.* This is fair and open; being a brief summary of that *admiration* of the Scriptures which so abounds in Catholick Countreys; That *Hermannus* one of some account in your Church, affirmed that the Scriptures could be of no more Authority then

then *Æſops Fables*, were they not confirmed by the Teſtimony of your Church; we are informed by one *Brentius*, and we believe the information to be true becauſe the ſaying is defended by *Hoſius de Authoritat. Script. Lib.* 3. who adds unto it of his own; *Revera niſi nos Authoritas Eccleſiæ doceret hanc ſcripturam eſſe Canonicam, perexiguum apud nos pondus haberet: the truth is, if the Authority of the Church did not teach us that this Scripeure is Canonical, it would be of very light weight unto us.* Such *Cordial reſpects* do you bear unto it. And the forementioned *Andradius Defenſ. Con. Trid. Lib.* 2. to the ſame purpoſe; *Neq, enim in ipſis libris quibus ſacra myſteria conſcripta ſunt, quicquam in eſt Divinitatis quæ nos ad credendum quæ in illis continentur religione aliqua conſtringat, ſed Eccleſia, quæ codices illos ſacros eſſe docet, & antiquorum Patrum fidem & pietatem commendat, tanta ineſt vis & amplitudo, ut illis nemo ſine graviſſimâ impietatis nota poſſit repugnare; neither is there in thoſe books wherein the Divine Myſteries are written any thing or any character of Divinity or divine original which ſhould on a religious account oblige us to believe the things that are contained in them. But yet ſuch is the force and Authority of the Church which teacheth thoſe books to be ſacred, and commendeth the faith and piety of the Antient fathers, that no man can oppoſe them without a grievous mark of impiety.* How, by what means, from whom ſhould we learn the ſenſe of your Church, if not from your *Council of Trent*, and ſuch mighty Champions of it? Do you think it equitable, that we ſhould liſten to ſuggeſtions of every *obſcure Frier*, and entertain thoughts from them about the ſenſe of your Church, contrary to the plain aſſertion of your *Councils* and and great Rabbies? And if this be the reſpect that

in

in *Catholick Countries* is given to the Scripture, I hope you will not find may of your *Countrymen* rivals with them therein. It is all but *Hayle* and *Crucifie*; We *reſpect* the Scriptures, but there is *another part* of Gods word beſides them; we *reſpect* the Scriptures, but *Traditions* contain more of the Doctrine of Truth; we *reſpect* the Scriptures, but think it not meet that Chriſtians be *ſuffered* to read them; we *reſpect* the Scripture, but do not think that it hath any *character* in it of its own Divine original for which we ſhould believe it; we *reſpect* the Scripture, but yet we would not believe, were it not *commended* unto us by our Church; we *reſpect* the Scripture, but it is *dark*, *obſcure*, not intelligible but by the interpretation of our Church. Pray Sir, keep your reſpects at home, they are *deſpiſed* by the Scripture it ſelf, which gives Teſtimony unto its own *Authority*, *Perfection*, *Sufficiency*, to guide us to God, *Perſpicuity* and *Certainty* without any reſpect unto your Church, or its Authority: And we know its Teſtimony to be true. And for our parts we fear that whileſt theſe *Joabs* kiſſes of reſpect are upon your lips, you have a ſword in your right hands to let out all the Vitals of Divine Truth and Religion. Do you think your general expreſſions of *reſpect*, and that *unto admiration*, are a covering long and broad enough to hide all this contempt and reproach that you continually poure upon the Scriptures? Deal thus with your *Ruler*, and ſee whether he will accept your Perſon. Give him ſome good words in general, but let your particular expreſſions of your eſteem of him come ſhort of what his ſtate and *regal* dignity do require, will it be well taken at your hands? Expreſſions of the ſame nature with theſe inſtanced in, might be collected out of your chiefeſt Authors

Authors ſufficient to fill a volume, and yet I never read nor heard that any of them were ever *ſtoned* in your Catholick Countreys, whatever you intimate of the boyling up of your zeal into a rage *againſt thoſe that ſhould go about to diminiſh it*. Indeed whatever you pretend, this is your faith about the Scripture; and therefore I deſire that you would accept of this account why I cannot comply with your wiſh, and not ſpeak any more of *Papiſts* ſlighting the Scripture, ſeeing I know they do ſo in the ſenſe and way by me expreſſed, and other wayes I never ſaid they did ſo.

From the account of your *Faith*, we may proceed to your *Charity* wherewith you cloſe this Diſcourſe. Speaking of your *Roman Catholicks*, you ſay, *the Scripture is theirs*, and *Jeſus Chriſt is theirs, who will one day plead their Cauſe*. What do you mean Sir by theirs? Do you intend it excluſively to all others; ſo *theirs* as not to be the right and portion of any other. It is evident that this is your *ſenſe*, not only becauſe unleſs it be ſo, the words have neither *ſenſe* nor *emphaſis* in them; but alſo becauſe ſuitably unto this ſenſe, you elſewhere declare that the *Roman* and the *Catholick Church* are with you one and the ſame. This is *your Charity* fit to accompany, and to be the fruit of the faith before diſcourſed of. This is your *Chatholiciſm*, the impaling of Chriſt, Scripture, the Church and conſequently all acceptable Religion to the *Roman* Party and Faction; down right *Donatiſm*, the wretchedeſt *Schiſm* that ever rent the Church of God, which makes the wounds of Chriſtendome incurable, and all hope of coalition in Love deſperate.

Saint *Paul* directing one of his *Epiſtles* unto all that in every place call *upon the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, that no countenance from that expreſſi-

on

on of *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* might be given unto any ſurmize of his appropriating unto himſelf and thoſe with him a *peculiar intereſt* in Jeſus Chriſt, he adds immediately *both their Lord and ours*; the Lord of all that in every place call upon his name, 1 *Cor.* 1. This was the old *Catholiciſm*, which the new hath as much affinity unto as darkneſs hath to light, and not one jot more. The *Scripture is ours*, and *Chriſt is ours*, and what have any elſe to do with them? what though in other places, you call on the name of Jeſus Chriſt, yet *he is our Lord, not yours*. This I ſay is that wretched *Schiſm*, which cloathed with the name of *Catholiciſm* (which after it had ſlain, it robbed of its name and garments) the world for ſome ages hath groaned under, and is like to do ſo, whilſt it is ſupported by ſo many *ſecular advantages* and intereſts, as are ſubſervient unto it at this day.

CHAP. 14.

Of Reaſon. Jews objections againſt Chriſt.

PAg. 27. You proceed to vindicate your *unreaſonable* Paragraph about *Reaſon*, or rather againſt it. What *reaſon* we are to expect in a diſpute againſt the *uſe* of Reaſon in and about the things which are the *higheſt* and moſt proper object of it, is eaſie for any one to imagine. For by *Reaſon* in Religion we underſtand not meerly the Ratiocination of a man, upon and according to the inbred Principles of his nature, but every *acting* of the underſtanding of a man about the things of God, proceeding from ſuch Principles, or guided by any ſuch rule,

rule, as no way impeach its rationality. To vindicate your diſcourſe in your *Fiat* upon this *ſubject* you make uſe of two *mediums*. (1.) You pretend *that to be the whole ſubject of your Diſcourſe about Reaſon*, which is but a part of it: and (2.) You deny *that* to *be the Deſign and aime* of your Book which your ſelf know, and all other men acknowledge ſo to be.

On the firſt head you tell me that your Diſcourſe concerned *Reaſon to be excluded from the employment of framing Articles of Religion*. It is true, you talk ſomewhat to that purpoſe; and you were told that *Proteſtants* were no way concerned in that Diſcourſe. And it is no leſs true, that you diſpute againſt the *uſe* and exerciſe of Reaſon in our *choiſe* of or adhering unto any Religion, or any way or practice in Religion; that is the Liberty of a mans *rational judgement* in determining what is right, and what is wrong, what true, what falſe, in the things that are propoſed unto him, as belonging unto Religion, guided, bounded, and determined by the *only Rule* meaſure and laſt *umpire* in and about ſuch things; This you *oppoſe* and that directly; and that to this end, to ſhew unto *Proteſtants* that they can come unto *no certainty* in Religion by this exerciſe of their Reaſon, in and about the things of God. That men ſhould by the uſe of Reaſon endeavour to *find out* and frame a Religion, is fond to imagine. They who ever attempted any ſuch thing, knew it was *not Religion* but a pretence to ſome other end, that they were coyning. To make the reaſon of a man proceeding and acting upon it its own light and *inbred Principles*, the abſolute and Soveraign judge of the things that are propoſed to be believed or practiſed in Religion, ſo as that it ſhould be free for him to receive or reject them

them according as they anſwer and are ſuited thereunto, is no leſs *abſurd* and fooliſh; and who ever will aſſert it muſt build his Aſſertion on this ſuppoſition, that a man is capable of comprehending fully and clearly, whatſoever God *can reveal* of himſelf; which is contrary to the *prime Dictates* of Reaſon in reference unto the ſimplicity and infiniteneſs of Gods being, and ſo would imply a *contradiction* in its firſt admiſſion. It is no leſs untrue, that a man in the *lapſed depraved condition* of nature, can by the light thereof and the utmoſt improvement of his reaſon, come to a *ſaving*, *ſanctifying* perception of the things themſelves, that God hath revealed concerning himſelf his will and worſhip, which is the peculiar *effect* of the ſpirit and grace of Chriſt. But to ſay, that a man is not *to uſe his reaſon* in finding out the ſenſe and meaning of the *propoſitions* wherein the Truths of Religion are repreſented unto him, and in judging of their truth and falſhood by the *Rule* of them, which is the Scripture, is to deny that *indeed we are men*, and to put a reproach upon our mortality, by intimating, that men do not, cannot, nor ought to do that which they not only *know* they do, but alſo that they cannot *but* do. For they do but vainly deceive themſelves who *ſuppoſe* or rather *dream* that they make any determination of what is *true* or falſe in Religion, without the *uſe* and exerciſe of *their Reaſon*; it is to ſay they do it as *beaſts*, and not as men; then which nothing can be ſpoken more to the diſhonour of Religion, nor more effectual to *deter* men from the entertainment of it. For our parts, we rejoyce in this, that we dare avow *the Religion* which we profeſs to *be highly rational*; and that the moſt *myſterious Articles* of it are propoſed unto our belief on grounds of the moſt unqueſtionable

questionable reason, and such as cannot be rejected without a *Contradiction* to the most Soveraign dictates of that Intellectual nature wherewith of God we are endued. And it is not a *few trifling instances* of some mens *abuse* of their Reason in its prejudicate exercise about the things of God, that shall make us ingrateful to God that he hath made us *men*, or to neglect the laying out of the *best* that he hath intrusted us with by nature, in his service in the work of Grace. And what course do you your self proceed in? When any thing is *proposed* unto you concerning Religion, do you not *think* upon it? doth not your mind exercise about it those *first acts* of Reason or Understanding which prepare and dispose you to *discourse* and *compute* it with your self? do you not consider whither the thing it self be *good* or evil? and whither the *propositions* wherein it is made unto you are true or false? do you not call to mind the *Rule* and measure whereby you are to make a *judgement*, whither they be so or no? we talk not now, *what that Rule* is, but only whither you do not make a judgement of the Propositions that are made unto you by some *Rule* or other, and whither with that judgement, your mind do not assent unto them or dissent from them? Yea is not *your judgement* which you so make, the *assent* or *dissent* of your mind? or what course do you take? I wish you would inform us of your excellent expedient to teach a man to cry *Credo* without the use or exercise of his *Reason* to bring him thereunto. But when you have done so, I know it is no other way but that by it you may teach a *Parrat* or *Starling* to say as much, or the *Crow* that cryed of old ἔσται πάντα καλῶς. But you would evade all concernment in this Discourse, by denying that your *Fiat Lux*, *was written unto any*

ſuch concernment againſt Proteſtants. I know not well what you mean by your, *Unto any ſuch concernment againſt Proteſtants.* That the main deſign of your Diſcourſe, is to bring *Proteſtants* unto an *uncertainty* in their profeſſion by everting the Principles which you apprehend them to build upon, and thereon to perſwade them unto *Popery*, I was in hope you would have no more denyed. It hath been evidenced unto you with as needleſs a labour as ever any man was put unto; but it is done becauſe you would needs have it ſo, and ſhall not now be done again.

Your enſuing Diſcourſe wherein you attempt to ſay ſomething unto the ninth *Chapter of the Animadverſions* is not unlike the preceding; and therefore I ſhall caſt them under one head. Your buſineſs in it, is to caſt a *freſh diſhonour* upon Chriſtian Religion by queſtioning the *defenſibility* of its Principles againſt *Jewiſh Objections*, any otherwiſe then by an *irrational Credo*. Let us hear you ſpeak in your own language; *Your vaunting floriſhes*, you ſay, *about Scripture which you love to talk on, will not without the help of your Credo and humble reſignation ſolve the Argument, which that you may the eaſilier be quit of, you never examine, but only run on in your uſual floriſhes about the uſe and excellency of Gods Word. I told you in* Fiat Lux, *what the Jew will reply to all ſuch reaſonings: but you have the pregnant wit not to heed any thing that may hinder your floriſhes; but if you were kept up in a Chamber with a learned Jew without bread, water and fire, till you had ſatisfied him in that objection, I am ſtill well enough aſſured, for all your very vaunts, that if you do not make uſe of your* Credo, *which here you contemn, you might there ſtay till hunger and cold have made an end of you.* The meaning of this Diſcourſe is, that the *Jews* pretence of

of rejecting Chriſt upon the *Authority* and *Tradition* of their Church, was not, nor is to be ſatisfied by *Teſtimonies* given in the Scripture unto the *Perſon*, *Doctrine* and *Work* of the *Meſſias*. The ſum of the Objection laid down in your *Fiat Lux* is that which I have now mentioned; It was the Plea of *the Jews* againſt Chriſt and his Doctrine, managed from the *Authority* and *Tradition* of their Church; That Chriſt and his Apoſtles gave the Anſwer unto this objection, which I have now *intimated*, namely the Teſtimony of God himſelf in the Scripture to the Truth of that which they objected againſt, which was to be preferred unto the Authority and Teſtimony of their Church, I have undeniably proved unto you in the *Animadverſions*; and it is manifeſt to every one that hath but read the *New Teſtament* with any Conſideration or underſtanding. The ſame way was perſiſted in by the *Antient Fathers*, as all their writings againſt the Jews do teſtifie. And I muſt now tell you that your calling the *validity of this* Anſwer into Queſtion, is highly injurious unto the *honour of Chriſtianity*, and *blaſphemous* againſt Chriſt himſelf. The beſt interpretation that I can give unto your words, is, that you are a perſon *wholly ignorant* of the Controverſies that are between the *Jews and Chriſtians*, and the way that is to be taken for their ſatisfaction or confutation. You tell us indeed in your *Fiat*, that the Jews *will reply* to theſe Teſtimonies of Scripture which are alledged as giving witneſs to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and his Doctrine, and contend about the *interpretation* of them; and this you tell me, *I have the wit to take no notice of*; which by the way is unduly averred by you, and contrary to your own *Science* and *Conſcience*, ſeeing you profeſs that you have read over my *Animadver-*

ſions; and probably the very place wherein I do take notice of what you ſaid to that purpoſe and replyed unto it, was not far from your eye when you wrote the contrary. And as I ſhewed you what was the *opinion* of the *Antients* of that reply of the *Jews* which you mention, ſo I ſhall now add, that nothing but *groſs ignorance* in theſe things can give countenance to an imagination that there is any thing but *folly* and *madneſs* in the *Rabbinical* evaſions of the Teſtimonies of the old Teſtament given unto our Lord Chriſt and his Goſpel. And your ſubſtitution of a *naked fananical Credo*, not reſolved into the Teſtimony of the Holy Writ in the room of that *expreſs Witneſs* which is given in Holy Scripture unto the *Perſon* and *Doctrine* of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to oppoſe therewith the *Judaical Plea* from their Church, State, Power and Authority, is an Engine fit to undermine the very root of Chriſtianity, and to render the whole Goſpel highly Queſtionable. Beſides it is ſo abſurd as to the Conviction of *the Jews*, ſuch a mere *petitio principii* or begging of what is in Controverſie between Chriſtians and them, that I challenge you to produce any *one learned man* that hath made uſe of it to that purpoſe. To think that your *Credo* built on principles which *he deſpiſeth*, which you cannot prove unto him, will convince another man of the *Truth of what you believe*, can have no other ground but a *magical fancy*, that the *fixing* of your *imagination* ſhall affect his, and conform it unto your apprehenſion of things. Such is your courſe in telling the *Jews* of the Authority of your Church, and your *Credo* thereupon, which cannot be ſuppoſed to have any *exiſtence* in *rerum natura*, unleſs it be firſt ſuppoſed that their Church was failed, which *ſuppoſal* that it was not, is the ſole foundation of their objection.

objection. What end you can *propoſe* herein, but to expoſe your ſelf and your profeſſion unto their *ſcorn* and contempt, I know not. Sir, the Lord Chriſt *confirmed* himſelf to be the Son of God, and Saviour of the world by *the Miracles* which he wrought; and the Doctrine which he taught was *teſtified* to be Divine by ſigns and expreſs words from Heaven. He proved it alſo by the *Teſtimonies* out of the Law and Prophets, all which was confirmed by his *Reſurrection* from the dead. This *coming* of the *promiſed Meſſiah*, the work that he was to perform, and the *characteriſtical* τεκμήρια of him, in application unto the perſon of *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts proved out of the Scripture, to the conviction and converſion of thouſands of the Jews, and the confuſion of the reſt. And if you know not that the *Antients Fathers* and learned men of ſucceeding Ages, have undenyably proved againſt the *Jews* out the Scripture of the *Old Teſtament*, and by the Teſtimony thereof, that the *promiſed Meſſiah* was to be God and man in one Perſon, that he was to come at the time of the appearance of *our Lord Jeſus Chriſt in the fleſh*, that *the work* which he was to perform was the very ſame and no other then what was wrought and accompliſhed by him, with all the other *important concernments* of his Perſon and office, ſo that they have nothing left to countenance them in their obſtinacy, but meer *ſenſeleſs triſles*, you are exceedingly unmeet to make uſe of their objections, or the condition of the controverſie between them and Chriſtians. For what you add in reference unto my ſelf, I ſhall need only to mind you that the Queſtion is not about any *Perſonal* ability of mine to *ſatisfie a Jew*, which whatever it be, when I have a mind to encreaſe it,

for ſomewhat that I know of, and which I have learned out of their writings, I will not come unto you for aſſiſtance; but concerning the ſufficiency of *that Principle* for the confronting of *Judaical objections*, taken from *the Authority of their Church*, which I have formerly proved unto you, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles made uſe of unto that purpoſe. And I will not ſay that it was from the *pregnancy of your wit*, that whatever heed you took unto the ſtating of the Caſe between you and *Proteſtants* in the *Animadverſions* parallel unto that between the *Jews* and the *Apoſtles*, (ſeeing a very little wit will ſuffice to direct a man to let that alone which he finds too heavy for him to remove out of his way) that you ſpeak not one word unto it, yet I will ſay, that it is a thing of that kind whereof there are frequent inſtances in your whole Diſcourſe, and for what reaſon, is not very difficult for any man to conjecture.

CHAP. 15.

Pleas of Prelate Proteſtants. Chriſt the only ſupream and abſolute Head of the Church.

PAg. 49. You take a view of the tenth Chapter of the *Animadverſions*, oppoſed unto the *thirteenth and fourteenth* Paragraph of your *Fiat Lax*, wherein you pretend to ſet forth *the various Pleas* of thoſe that are at *Difference* amongſt us in matters of Religion. Theſe you there diſtribute into *Independents*, *Presbyterians* and *Proteſtants*. Here omitting the Conſideration of the two former, you apply your ſelf unto what was ſpoken about *Prelate Proteſtants* as you call them. *You endeavour*, ſay you,

to

to diſable both what I have ſet down to make againſt the Prelate Proteſtant, and alſo what I have ſaid for him. I ſaid in Fiat Lux, *that it made not a little againſt our Proteſtants, that after the Prelate Proteſtancy was ſetled in* England, *they were forced for their own preſervation againſt the Puritans to take up ſome of thoſe Principles again, which former Proteſtants had caſt down for Popiſh, as is the Authority of the viſible Church, efficacy of ordination, difference between Clergy and Laity. Here firſt you deny that theſe Principles are Popiſh; But Sir, there are ſome Jews even at this day who will deny any ſuch man as* Pontius Pilate *to to have ever been in* Jewry. *I have other things to do then to fill volumes with uſeleſs texts, which here I might eaſily do out of the books both of the firſt Reformers and Catholick Divines and Councils.*

What acquaintance you have with the *Jews*, we have in part ſeen already, and ſhall have occaſion hereafter to examine a little further. In the mean time you may be pleaſed to take notice that men who know what they ſay, are not eaſily affrighted from it by a ſhew of ſuch *Mormoes*, as he in the *Comedian* was from his own houſe by his ſervants pretence that it was haunted by *Sprights*, when there were none in it, but his own *debauched* companions. I denyed thoſe Opinions to be *Popiſh*, and ſhould do ſo ſtill, were I accuſed for ſo doing before a *Roman* Judge as corrupt and wicked as *Pontius Pilate*. For I can prove them to be more *Antient* then any part of *Popery*, in the ſenſe explained in the *Animadverſions*, and admitted generally by Proteſtants. We never eſteem every thing *Popiſh* that *Papiſts* hold or believe. Some things in your Profeſſion belong unto your *Chriſtianity*, ſome things to your *Popery*. And I am perſwaded you do not think this *Propoſition*, *Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, to *be Heretical*, be-

cauſe thoſe whom you account *Hereticks* do profeſs and believe it. Prove the Principles you mention to be *invented* by your ſelves, without any *foundation* in the Scripture, or conſtant *ſuffrage* of the Antient Churches, and you prove them to be *Popiſh*, to be your own. If you cannot do ſo, though *Papiſts* profeſs them, yet they may be *Chriſtian*. This is ſpoken as to the *Principles* themſelves, not unto your explanation of them, which in ſundry particulars is *Popiſh*, which were never owned by Prelate Proteſtants. You proceed, *You challenge me to prove that theſe Principles were ever denyed by our Prelate Proteſtants, And this you do wittily and like your ſelf. You therefore bid me prove that thoſe principles were ever denyed by our Prelate Proteſtants, becauſe I ſay that our Prelate Proteſtants here in* England, *as ſoon as they became ſuch, took up again thoſe forenamed Principles, which Proteſtants their forefathers both here in* England *and beyond Seas before our Prelacy was ſet up had ſtill rejected. When I ſay then that our Prelate Proteſtants affirmed and aſſerted thoſe Principles which former Proteſtants denyed, you bid me prove that ever our Prelate Proteſtants ever denyed them.* But whatever you can prove or cannot prove, you have made it very eaſie for any man to prove, that you have very little regard unto *truth* and ſobriety in what you aver, ſo that you may acquit your ſelf from that which preſſeth you, and which according to the rules of them you cannot ſtand before. You tell us in the entrance of this diſcourſe, that you ſaid, *that Prelate Proteſtants for their own preſervation took up ſome of thoſe Principles again which former Proteſtants had caſt down for Popiſh.* And here expreſly, that you *ſaid not that they took up the Principles which themſelves had caſt down, but only thoſe which other before them had ſo dealt withall.* Now pray take a view of your own words, whereby you

you express your self in this matter. Chap. 3. S. 14. p. 189. ed. 2. Are they not these? *The Prelate Protestant to defend himself against them* (the Presbyterians and Independents) *is forced to make use of those very Principles, which himself afore time* (not other Protestants but himself) *when he* (not others) *first contended against Popery, destroyed. So that upon him falls most heavily even like Thunder and Lightning from Heaven, utterly to kill and cut him a sunder, that great Oracle delivered by St.* Paul, *If I build up again the things, I* (not another) *formerly destroyed, I make my self a prevaricator, an Impostor, a Reprobate.* What think you of these words? do you charge the *Prelate Protestant* with building up what *others* had pulled down, or what he had destroyed *himself?* Is your Rule out of St. *Paul* applicable unto him upon any other account, but that *he himself* was both the *builder* and *destroyer?* Sir, such miscarriages as these *Protestants* know to be mortal sins; and if without contrition for them you have celebrated any Sacrament of your Church, it cannot be avoided but that you have brought a great inconvenience on some of your Disciples. Besides suppose you had spoken as you now *faign* your self to have done, I desire to know who they are whom you intend when you say *our Prelate Protestants so soon as they became such*, as though they were *first Protestants* at large and destroyed those Principles, which afterwards they built up when they became *Prelate Protestants*; seeing all men know that our Reformation was begun by *Prelates* themselves, and such as never disclaimed the *Principles* by you instanced in.

But you tell me, *I do not only reject what you object against Prelate Protestants, but also what you alledge*

in

in their behalf. I do ſo indeed; though I *laugh* not at you or it, as you pretend; and ſo muſt any man do, who pleading for *Proteſtancy* hath not a mind *openly* to prevaricate. For your *Plea* for them is ſuch, as if admitted, would not only overthrow your *Prelacy* which you pretend to aſſert, but alſo deſtroy your *Proteſtancy* which you will not deny but that you ſeek to oppoſe. Nay it is no other, but what was contradicted in the very *Council* of *Trent* by the *Spaniſh Prelates*, as that which they conceived to have been an engine contrived for the Ruine of *Epiſcopacy* under a pretence of eſtabliſhing it; and which inſteed of aſſerting them to be *Biſhops* in the Church, would have rendred them all *Curates* to the Pope. You would have us believe that Chriſt hath appointed *one Epiſcopal Monarch* in his Church with plenitude of power to repreſent his own Perſon, which is the *Pope*, and from him all other *Biſhops* to derive their power, being ſubſtituted *by him*, and *unto him* unto their work. And muſt not this needs be an *acceptable defenſative* or Plea unto *Prelate Proteſtants*, which if it be admitted, they can be no longer ſuppoſed to be made *Overſeers of their flocks* by the Holy Ghoſt, but by the Pope, which forfeits their *Prelacy*, and beſides aſſerts his *Supremacy*, which deſtroyes their *Proteſtancy*?

Upon this occaſion, you proceed to *touch* upon ſomewhat of great *importance* concerning the *Head of the Church*, wherein you know a great part of the difference between your ſelf and thoſe whom you oppoſe to conſiſt. In your paſſage you mention the uſe of *true Logick*, but I fear we ſhall find that in your Diſcourſe *laudatur & alget*. I ſhould have been glad to have found you making what uſe you were able of that which you commend. It would I

ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe have directed you to have ſtated *plainly* and clearly what is it that you aſſert, and what it is that you *oppoſe*, and to have given your Arguments *Cataſcenaſtical* of the one, and *Anaſcenaſtical* of the other; but either you know not that way of proceedure, or you conſidered how little advantage unto your end you were like to obtain thereby. And therefore you make uſe only of that *part of Logick* which teacheth the nature and kinds of *Sophiſms*; in particular, that of confounding things which ought to be diſtinguiſhed. However your Diſcourſe, ſuch as it is, ſhall be examined, and that by the rules of that *Logick* which your ſelf commend.

You ſay pag. 51. *The Church ſays I muſt have a Biſhop, or otherwiſe ſhe will not have ſuch a viſible Head as ſhe had at firſt. This that you may enervate, you tell me, that the Church hath ſtill the ſame Head ſhe had which is Chriſt, who is preſent with his Church by his Spirit and his Laws, and is man God ſtill as much as ever he was; and ever the ſame will be; and if I would have any other viſible Biſhop to be head, then it ſeems I would not have the ſame head, and ſo would have the ſame, and not the ſame.*

This is but *one part* of my anſwer, and that very *lamely* and *imperfectly* reported. The *Reader* if he pleaſe may ſee the whole of it, *Ch.* 10. *p.* 223, *&c.* and therewithall take a *ſpecimen* of your ingenuity in this Controverſie. It were very ſufficient to render your following *exceptions* againſt it uſeleſs unto your purpoſe, meerly to *repeat* what you ſeek to oppoſe; but becauſe you ſhall not have any pretence, that any thing you have *ſayd* is paſſed over *undiſcuſſed*, I ſhall conſider what you offer in way of exception to ſo much of my anſwer as you are pleaſed your ſelf to expreſs, and as may be ſuppoſed, thought your

your ſelf *qualified* to deal withal. Thus then you proceed;

I cannot in Reaſon be thought to ſpeak otherwiſe, if We would uſe true Logick, of the Identity of the head, then I do of the Identity of the body of the Church. This body is not numerically the ſame; for the men of the firſt age are long ago gone out of the world, and another generation come, who yet are a body of Chriſtians of the ſame kind, though not numerically the ſame; So do I require that ſince Jeſus Chriſt as man, the head immediate of other believing men, is departed hence to the glory of his father, that the Church ſhould ſtill have an Head of the ſame kind, as viſibly now preſent, as ſhe had in the beginning; or elſe ſay I, ſhe cannot be compleatly the ſame body, or a body of the ſame kind viſible as ſhe was. But this ſhe hath not, this ſhe is not, except ſhe have a viſible Biſhop as ſhe had in the beginning preſent with her guiding and ruling under God. Chriſt our Lord is indeed ſtill Man God, but his manhood is now ſeparate; nor is he viſibly preſent as man, which immediately headed his believers under God, on whoſe influence their nature depended. His Godhead is ſtill the ſame in all things not only in its ſelf, but in order to his Church alſo as it was before equally inviſible, and in the like manner believed; but the nature delegate under God, and once ruling viſibly amongſt us by words and examples, is now utterly withdrawn. And if a nature of the ſame kind be not now delegate with a power of exterior Government, as at the firſt then was, then hath not the Church the ſame head now, which ſhe had then: qui habet aures audiendi audiat.

How you have ſecured your *Logick* in this Diſcourſe, ſhall afterwards be conſidered; your *Divi-*

nity

nity ſeems at the firſt view lyable unto juſt except ons. For, 1. You ſuppoſe Chriſt in his *humane nature only* to have been the Head of his Church, and therefore the abſence of that, to neceſſitate the conſtitution of another. Now this ſuppoſition is openly *falſe* and dangerous to the whole being of Chriſtianity. It is the *Son of God* who is the Head of the Church; who as he is man, ſo alſo is he *over all God bleſſed for ever*: And as God and man in one perſon, is that Head, and ever was ſince his *incarnation*, and ever will be to the end of the world. To deny this is to overthrow the *foundation* of the Churches faith, preſervation and conſolation, it being founded and built on this, that he *was the Son of the living God*, Matth. 16. and yet into this ſuppoſition alone, is your imaginary neceſſity of the *Subſtitution of another Head* in his room reſolved. 2. You plainly confeſs that the preſent Church hath not the *ſame head*, that the Church had when our Lord Chriſt converſed with them in the *dayes of his fleſh*. That, you ſay, was his *humane nature delegate under God*, which being now removed and ſeparate, *another Perſon ſo delegate under God*, is ſubſtituted in his place. Which not only deprives the Church of its *firſt Head*, but alſo depoſeth the *humane nature of Chriſt* from that office of headſhip to his Church, which you confeſs that for a while it *enjoyed*: leaving him nothing but what belongs unto him as *God*, wherein alone you will allow him to be that unto his Church which formerly he was: Confeſſing I ſay, the *humane nature* of Chriſt to have been the head of the Church, and now denying it ſo to be, you do what lyes in you to depoſe him from his *Office* and Throne, allowing his humane nature as far as I can perceieve to be of little other uſe then

to

to be *eaten* by you in the *Maſs*. 3. You make your intention yet more evident, by intimating that the *Humane Nature of Chriſt* is now no more Head of the Church, then the preſent Church is made up of the ſame numerical members, that it was conſtituted of in the days of his fleſh. What *change* you ſuppoſe in the *Church* the body, the ſame you ſuppoſe and aſſert in the *head* thereof. And as that change excludes thoſe *former members* from being preſent members: ſo this *excludes* the former Head from being the preſent Head. Of old the Head of the Church was the *humane nature* of Chriſt delegate under God; now that is *removed*, and another perſon in the ſame nature is ſo delegated unto the ſame office. Now this is not *an Head* under Chriſt, but in *diſtinction* from him in the ſame place wherein he was, and ſo excluſive of him, which muſt needs be *Antichriſt*, one pretending to be in his room and place to his excluſion, that is, one ſet up againſt him. And thus alſo what you ſeek to avoid doth inevitably *follow* upon your diſcourſe, namely that *you would have the Church for the preſervation of its oneneſs and ſameneſs, to have the ſame head ſhe had, which is not the ſame*, unleſs you will ſay that the Pope is Chriſt: theſe are the Principles that you proceed upon. Firſt, you tell us, that the *humane nature of Chriſt delegate under God was the viſible Head of the Church*; Secondly, That *this nature is now removed from us and ceaſeth ſo to be*, that is, not only to be viſible, but the viſible Head of the Church, and is no more ſo, then the preſent Church is made up of the ſame individual members as it was in the dayes of his fleſh, which, as you well obſerve, it is not. Thirdly, That *a nature of the ſame kind in another Perſon* is now delegate under God to the ſame office of a Viſible

Viſible Head, with that power of external Government which Chriſt had whileſt he was that head. And is it not plain from hence, that you exclude the *Lord Chriſt* from being that head of his Church which he was in former dayes? and *ſubſtituting* another in his room and place, you at once depoſe him, and aſſign another head unto the Church, and that in your attempt to prove that her head muſt ſtill be the ſame, or ſhe cannot be ſo. Farther, the *humane nature* of Chriſt was perſonally united unto the Son of God: and if that Head which you now *fancy* the Church to have, be not *ſo united*, it is not the *ſame Head* that that was: and ſo whileſt you ſeek to eſtabliſh not indeed a *ſameneſs* in the Head of the Church, but a *likeneſs* in ſeveral Heads of it as to *viſibility*, you evidently aſſert a change in the nature of that Head of the Church which we enquire after. In a word, Chriſt and the Pope are not the *ſame*; and therefore if it be neceſſary to maintain that the Church hath the *ſame Head* that ſhe had, to aſſert that in the room of *Chriſt* ſhe hath the *Pope*, you prove that ſhe hath the ſame *head* that ſhe had, becauſe ſhe hath one that is not the *ſame* ſhe had: and ſo *qui habet aures audiat*. 4. You vainly *imagine* the whole Catholick Church any otherwiſe *viſible*, then with the eyes of faith and underſtanding. It was never ſo, no not when *Chriſt* converſed with it in the earth; no not if you ſhould ſuppoſe only his *bleſſed Mother*, his twelve Apoſtles, and ſome few more only to belong unto it. For though all the members of it might be *ſeen*, and that at once by the bodily eyes of men, as might alſo the *humane nature* of him who was the head of it, yet *as* he was Head of the Church, and in that his whole *Perſon* wherein he was ſo, and is

ſo,

ſo, he was never *viſible* unto any, *for no man hath ſeen God at any time.* And therefore you, ſubſtituting an Head in his room who in his *whole perſon* is viſible, ſeeing he was not ſo, do change the Head of the Church as to its *viſibility* alſo, (for one that is in his whole perſon *viſible*, and another that is not ſo, are not alike viſible) wherein you would principally place the *identity* of the Church. 5. Let us ſee whether *your Logick* be any better then your Divinity. The beſt *Argument* that can be formed out of your diſcourſe, is this. *If the Church hath not an head viſibly preſent with her, as ſhe had when Chriſt in his humane nature was on the earth, ſhe is not the ſame that ſhe was; but according to their Principles ſhe hath not an head now ſo viſibly preſent with her; therefore ſhe is not the ſame according unto them.* I deſire to know how you prove your inference. It is built on this ſuppoſition, that the *ſameneſs* of the Church depends upon the *viſibility* of its Head, and not on the *ſameneſs* of the Head its ſelf; which is a fond conceit, and contrary to expreſs Scripture, *Epheſ.* 4. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. and not capable of the leaſt countenance from Reaſon. It may be you will ſay, that though your *Argument* do not conclude that on our ſuppoſition the Church is not the *ſame* abſolutely as it was, yet it doth that it is not the ſame as to *viſibility*. Whereunto I anſwer, 1. That there is no neceſſity that the Church ſhould be alwayes the *ſame* as to *viſibility*, or alwayes *viſible* in the ſame manner, or alwayes equally viſible as to all concernments of it. 2. You miſtake the whole nature of the *viſibility* of the Church, ſuppoſing it to conſiſt in its being ſeen with the *bodily* eyes of men: whereas it is only an affection of its *publick profeſſion* of the Truth, whereunto its being

being *ſeen* in part or in whole by the eyes of any, or all men, doth no way belong. 3. That the Church, as I ſaid before, was indeed never abſolutely *viſible* in its Head and members: He who was the *Head* of it being never in his *whole perſon viſible* unto the the eyes of men, and he is yet as he was of old *viſible* to the eyes of faith, whereby we *ſee* him that *is inviſible*. So that to be *viſible* to the bodily eyes of men in its head and members, was never a property of the Church, much leſs ſuch an one, as that thereon its *ſameneſs* in all Ages ſhould depend. 6. You fail alſo in ſuppoſing that the *numerical ſameneſs* of the Church as a body, depends abſolutely on the *ſameneſs* of its members: For whileſt in ſucceſſion it hath all things the *ſame* that concur unto its Conſtitution, order, and exiſtence, it may be ſtill the *ſame body corporate*, though it conſiſt not of the ſame *individual perſons* or bodies natural: As the *Kingdom* of *England* is the ſame Kingdom that it was two hundred years ago, though there be not now *one* perſon living that then it was made up of. For though the *matter* be the ſame only *ſpecifically*, yet the *form* being the ſame *numerically*, that denominates the body to be ſo. But that I may the better repreſent unto you, the proper *genius* and deſign of your Diſcourſe, I ſhall briefly mind you of the principles which you *oppoſe* in it, and ſeek to evert by it, as alſo of thoſe which you intend to *compaſs* your purpoſe by. Of the firſt ſort are theſe; 1. *That the Lord Chriſt God and Man in one perſon is, and ever continues to be the only abſolute Monarchical Head of his own Church.* I ſuppoſe it needleſs for me to confirm this Principle by Teſtimonies of *Scripture*, which it being a matter of *pure Revelation* is the only way of confirmation

that it is capable of. That he is the *Head of his Church*, is ſo frequently averred, that every one who hath but read the New Teſtament will aſſent unto it upon the bare repetition of the words, with the ſame *faith* whereby he aſſents unto the writing its ſelf whatever it be: and we ſhall afterwards ſee that the *notion* of an Head is abſolutely excluſive of *competition* in the matter denoted by it. An *Head* properly is *ſingly* and abſolutely ſo: and therefore the ſubſtitution of *another head* unto the Church in the room of Chriſt, or with him, is perfectly *excluſive* of him from being ſo. 2. That *Chriſt as God-man in his whole perſon was never viſible to the fleſhly eyes of men*: and whereas, *as ſuch*, he was Head of the Church, as the Head of the Church, he was never abſolutely viſible. His *humane nature* was ſeen of old, which was but ſomething of him; *as* he was, and is the Head of the Church, otherwiſe then by faith, no man hath ſeen him at any time: and it changeth the condition of the Church, to ſuppoſe that now it hath a *Head*, who being a meer man, is in his *whole perſon viſible*, ſo far as a man may be ſeen. 3. That the *viſibility* of the Church conſiſteth in its *publick profeſſion* of the Truth, and not in its being objected to the bodily eyes of men. It is a thing that faith may *believe*, it is a thing that *Reaſon* may take notice of, conſider and comprehend; the eyes of the body being of no uſe in this matter. When a Church profeſſeth the Truth, it is the *ground and pillar* of it, a City on a hill; that is viſible though no man ſee it, yea though no man obſerve or contemplate on any thing about it. Its own *Profeſſion*, not other mens obſervation conſtitutes it viſible. Nor is there any thing more required to a Churches *viſibility*, but

its

its Profeſſion of the Truth, unto which all the outward advantages which it hath or may have of appearing *conſpicuouſly* or glorioufly to the conſideration of men, are purely accidental, which may be ſeparated from it without any prejudice unto its viſibility. 4. That the *ſameneſs* of the Church in all Ages doth not depend on its *ſameneſs* in reſpect of *degrees* of viſibility. That the Church be the ſame that it was, is required that it profeſs the ſame Truth it did, whereby it becomes *abſolutely* viſible: but the *degrees* of this viſibility, as to conſpicuouſneſs and *notoriety*, depending on things *accidental* unto the being, and conſequently viſibility of Church, do no way *affect* as unto any change. Now from hence it follows, 1. That the *preſence* or *abſence* of the *Humane nature of Chriſt* with, or from his Church on earth, doth not belong unto the *viſibility* of it; ſo that the abſence of it, doth no way inferr a neceſſity of *ſubſtituting* another viſible head in his ſtead. Nor was the *preſence* of his humane Nature with his Church any way neceſſary to the *viſibility* of it; his converſation on the earth being wholly for other ends and purpoſes. 2. That the *preſence* or *abſence* of the humane nature of Chriſt, not varying his headſhip, which under both conſiderations is ſtill the ſame, the ſuppoſition of *another Head* is perfectly deſtructive of the whole Headſhip of Chriſt, there being no *vacancy* poſſible to be imagined for that ſupply, but by the removal of Chriſt out of his place. For he being the Head of his Church as God and man, in his whole perſon inviſible, and the viſibility of the Church conſiſting ſolely in its own *profeſſion* of the Truth, the abſence of his humane nature from the earth, neither changeth his own *Headſhip*, nor prejudiceth the Churches *viſibility*: ſo that either

ther the one or the other of them ſhould induce a neceſſity of the ſupply of another Head. Conſider now what it is that you oppoſe unto theſe things. You tell us, 1. *That Chriſt was the Head of the Church in his humane nature delegated by and under God to that purpoſe.* You mean he was ſo *abſolutely*, and as man, excluſively to his divine nature. This your whole *Diſcourſe* with the Inferences that you draw from this ſuppoſition abundantly manifeſts. If you can make this good, you may conclude what you pleaſe: I know no man that hath any great cauſe to oppoſe himſelf unto you, for you have taken away the very *foundation* of the being and ſafety of the Church in your ſuppoſition. 2. You inform us, *That Chriſt by his Aſcenſion into heaven ceaſed to be that Head that he was, ſo that of neceſſity another muſt be ſubſtituted in his place and room*; and this we muſt think to be the Pope. He is I confeſs abſent from his Church here on earth, as to his bodily appearance amongſt us; which as it was not neceſſary as to his *Headſhip*, ſo he promiſed to ſupply the inconvenience which his Diſciples apprehended would enſue thereupon, ſo that they ſhould have great cauſe to rejoyce at it, as that wherein their great advantage would lye: *John* 16.7. That this ſhould be by giving us a *Pope* at *Rome* in his ſtead, he hath no way intimated. And unto thoſe who know what your *Pope* is, and what he hath done in the world, you will hardly make it evident, that the great *advantage* which the Lord Chriſt promiſed unto his Diſciples upon his *abſence*, is made good unto them by his Superviſorſhip. 3. You would have the *viſibility of the Church depend on the viſibility of its Head, as alſo its ſameneſs in all ages.* And no one, you are ſecure, who is now viſible, pretends

to

to be the Head of the Church, but the Pope alone, and therefore of necessity he it must be. But Sir, if the Lord Jesus Christ had had no other nature then that wherein he was *visible* to the eyes of men, he could never have been a *meet Head* for a Church dispersed throughout the whole world, nor have been able to discharge the Duty annexed by God unto that office. And if so, I hope you will not take it amiss, if on that supposition, I deem your *Pope*, of whom millions of Christians know nothing but by *uncertain* rumors, nor he of them, to be very unmeet for the discharge of it. And for the *visibility* of the Church, I have before declared wherein it doth consist. Upon the whole matter, you do not only come short of proving the *Indentity* and *Oneness* of the Church to depend upon one visible Bishop as its *Monarchical* Head, but also the Principles whereby you attempt the confirmation of that absurd position, are of that nature that they *exclude* the Headship of Christ, and infer no less change or alteration in the Church, then that which must needs ensue thereon, and the substitution of another in his room, which destroyes the very *essence* and being of it.

Let us now consider what you further reply unto that which was offered in the *Animadversions* unto the purpose now discoursed of. Your ensuing words are,

And here by the way we may take notice what a fierce English Protestant you are, who labour so stoutly to evacuate my argument for Episcopacy, and leave none of your own behind you, nor acquaint the world with any, though you know far better, but would make us believe notwithstanding those far better reasons, for Prelacy, that Christ himself, as he is the immediate Head

of

of invisible influence, so is he likewise the only and immediate Head of visible direction and government amongst us, without the interposition of any Person delegate in his stead to oversee and rule under him in his Church on earth, which is against the tenor both of sacred Gospel and St. Pauls *Epistles, and all Antiquity, and the present Ecclesiastical Polity of* England, *and is the Doctrine not of any English Protestant, but of the Presbyterian, Independent and Quaker.*

How little cause you have to attempt an impeachment of my *Protestancy*, I hope I have in some measure evidenced unto you, and shall yet farther make it manifest, as you give me occasion so to do. In the mean time as I told you before, that I would not plead the particular *concernment* of any party amongst *Protestants*, no more then you do that of any party among your selves, so I am sure enough that I have delivered nothing *prejudicial* unto any of them, because I have kept my self unto the defence of their *Protestancy* wherein they all agree. Nor have I given you an answer unto any Argument that tends in the least to the *confirmation* of such a *Prelacy* as by any sort of *Protestants* is admitted, but only shewed the emptiness and pernicious Consequences of your *Sophism*, wherewith you plead in pretence for Prelacy, indeed for a *Papal Supremacy*, and that on such Principles as are absolutely destructive of that *Protestant Prelacy* which you would be thought to give countenance unto. And your ensuing Discourse wherein you labour to justifie your reflection on me, is a *pittiful piece* of falsehood and Sophistry. For first, this *double Head* of the *Catholick Church*, one of influence, the other of direction and government, which you fancy some Protestants to admit of, is a thing that —— they declare against as injurious to the

the Lord Chriſt, and that which would render the Church *biceps monſtrum* horrid and deformed. It is Chriſt himſelf, who as by *his Spirit* he exerciſes the office of an head by inviſible influence, ſo by *his Word* that of viſible direction and rule; He is I ſay the only Head of viſible direction to his Church, though he be not a *viſible Head* to that purpoſe, which that he ſhould be, is to no purpoſe at all. 2. If by the *interpoſition of any perſon under Chriſt*, delegate in his ſtead, you underſtand any one ſingle Perſon delegated in his ſtead to overſee and rule the *whole Catholick Church*, ſuch an one as you now plead for in your Epiſtle, it is intolerable arrogancy to intimate that he is deſigned either in *the Goſpel* or St. *Pauls* Epiſtles, or *Antiquity*; whereas you are not able to aſſign any place, or text, or word in them, directly or by fair Conſequence to juſtifie what you aſſert. And for the preſent *Eccleſiaſtical polity* of the Church of *England*, if you yet know it not, let me inform you, that the very *foundations* of it are laid in a direct contrary ſuppoſition; namely that there is no ſuch *ſingle Perſon* delegated under Chriſt for the Rule of the whole Catholick Church; which gives us a new evidence of your Conſcientious care in what you ſay and write. 3. If you intend, (that which is not at all to your purpoſe) *Perſons to rule under Chriſt in the Church*, preſiding according to his direction and inſtitution, in and over the Particular Churches whereunto they do relate, governing them in his name, by his Authority, and according to his Word, I deſire you to inform me, wherein I have ſaid, or written, or intimated any thing that may give you the leaſt countenance in your affirming that by me it is *denied*; or where it was ever *denied* by any Proteſtant whatever, Prelatical, Presbyteri-

an, or Independent: neither doth this conceſſion of theirs in the leaſt impeach the *ſole Soveraign Monarchy* of Chriſt, and ſingle Headſhip over his Church to all ends and purpoſes. A *Monarch* may be, and is the ſole ſupream Governour and Political Head of his Kingdom, though he appoint others to execute his Laws by virtue of Authority derived from him, in the ſeveral *Provinces*, Shires and Pariſhes of it. And Chriſt is the only head of his Church, though he have appointed others *to preſide* and rule in his name, in thoſe diſtributions of his Diſciples whereinto they are caſt by his appoinment. But you proceed, *Chriſt in their way is immediate head not only of ſubminiſtration and influence, but of exterior derivation alſo and government to his Church. Anſ.* He is ſo, the *ſupream and only Head* of the Church Catholick in the one way and other, though the *means* of conveying influences of Grace, and of exterior Rule be various. *Then* ſay you, *is he ſuch an Head to all Believers or no?* to all, the whole body in general, and every individual member thereof in particular? *if he be ſo to all*, you ſay, *then no man is to be governed in Affairs of Religion by any other man*: But why ſo I pray? can no man govern in any ſenſe or place but he muſt be a ſupream Head? The *King* is immediate Head unto *all* his ſubjects, he is *King* not only to the whole Kingdom, but to every individual perſon in his Kingdom; doth it thence follow that they may not *be governed* by officers ſubordinate delegated under him to rule them by his *Authority* according to his Laws? or that if they may be ſo, that he is not the *only immediate King* and ſupream Head unto them all? The Apoſtle tells us expreſly that the *Head of every man is Chriſt*, 1 Cor. 11. 3. And that an head of Rule, as the *husband is the head*

of

of the wife, Epheſ. 5. 23. as well as he is an head of *influence* unto the whole body, and every member of it in particular, 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. *Col.* 2. 19. And it is a ſenſeleſs thing to imagine, that this ſhould in the leaſt impeach his appointment of men *to rule* under him in his Church according to his Law; who are thereupon not *heads*, but in reſpect of him *ſervants*, and in reſpect to the particular Churches wherein they ſerve him, *Rulers* or guides, yea their *ſervants* for his ſake; not *Lords* over the flocks, but *Miniſters* of their faith. By theſe are the *flocks* of Chriſt governed, as by *ſhepherds* appointed by him the great *Biſhop* and *Shepherd* of their ſouls, according to the Rules by him preſcribed for the rule of the one, and obedience of the other. But if by *governed by another man*, you mean *abſolutely*, *ſupreamly*, at his will and pleaſure, then we deny that any *Diſciple* of Chriſt is in the things of God, *ſo to be governed* by any man, and affirm that to aſſert it, is to caſt down Jeſus Chriſt from his Throne. But you ſay, *if he be not immediate head unto all, but Miniſters head the people, and Chriſt heads the Miniſters, this in effect is nothing but to make every Miniſter a Biſhop. Why do you not plainly ſay what it is more then manifeſt you would have? All this while you heed no more the Laws of the Land, then conſtitutions of the Goſpel. Anſw.* I have told you how Chriſt is the *immediate Head* unto all, and yet how he hath appointed others to preſide in his Churches under him; and that this ſhould infer an *equality* in all that are by him appointed to that work, is moſt ſenſeleſs to imagine, nor did I in the leaſt intimate any ſuch thing, but only that therefore there was no need of any *one ſupream head* of the whole Catholick Church, nor any place or room left for ſuch an one without the

the *depoſition* of Chriſt himſelf. Becauſe the King is the only *ſupream Head* of all his people, doth it therefore follow that if he appoint *Conſtables* to rule in every pariſh, with that allotment of power which by his Laws he gives unto them, and *Juſtices of Peace* to rule over them in an whole County, that therefore every *Conſtable* in effect is a Juſtice of Peace, or that there is a *ſameneſs* in their office? Chriſt is the head of every man that is in the Church, be he Biſhop, or Miniſter, or private man: and when the Miniſters are ſaid to *head the people*, or the *Biſhops* to head them, the expreſſion is improper; an inferiour *Miniſterial* ſubordinate rule being expreſſed by the name of that which is ſupream and abſolute: or they *head them* not abſolutely, but in ſome reſpect only, as every one of them *diſchargeth* the Authority over and towards them wherewith he is intruſted. This aſſertion of Chriſts ſole abſolute Headſhip, and denial of any *Monarchical* ſtate in the Church Catholick but what ariſeth from thence, doth not as every child may ſee, concern the difference that is about the ſuperiority of *Biſhops* to Miniſters or *Presbyters*. For notwithſtanding this, there are *degrees* in the Miniſtry of the Church, and ſeveral *orders* of men are engaged therein, and whatever there are, there might have been more, had it ſeemed to our good Lord Chriſt to appoint them. And whatever *order* of men may be ſuppoſed to be inſtituted by him in his Church, he muſt be ſuppoſed to be the *Head* of them all, and they are all to ſerve him in the *Duties* and Offices that they have to diſcharge towards the Church and one another. This headſhip of Chriſt is the thing that you are to *oppoſe*, and its excluſiveneſs to the ſubſtitution of an abſolute Head

over

over the whole Catholick Church in his place becauſe of his bodily abſence from the earth. But this you caſt out of ſight, and inſtead thereof, fall upon the *equality* of Biſhops and Miniſters, which no way enſues thereon. Both Biſhops and Presbyters agreeing well enough in the Truth we aſſert and plead for: *This*, you ſay, *is contrary to the Goſpel and the Law of the Land.* What is I pray? that *Chriſt is the only abſolute Head of the Catholick Church*? No; but *that Biſhops and Miniſters are in effect all one.* But what is that to your purpoſe? will it advantage your Cauſe what way ever that *problem* be determined? Was any occaſion offered you to diſcourſe upon that Queſtion? Nay you perceive well enough your ſelf, that this is nothing at all to your deſign, and therefore in your following diſcourſe you *double* and *ſophiſticate*, making it evident that either you *underſtand not your ſelf* what you ſay, or that you would not have *others* underſtand you, or that you *confound* all things with a deſign to deceive: for when you come to ſpeak of the *Goſpel* you attempt to prove the appointment of *one ſupream Paſtor* to the whole Catholick Church, and by *the Law of the Land*, the Superiority of Biſhops over Miniſters, as though theſe things were the *ſame*, or had any relation one to another: whereas we have ſhewed the *former* in your ſenſe to be deſtructive to the latter. Truth never put any man upon ſuch *ſubter fuges*; and I hope the difficulties that you find your ſelf *perplexed* withall, may direct you at length to find, that there is *a deceit in your right hand.* But let us hear your own words.

As for the Goſpel, the Lord who had been viſible Governour and Paſtor of his flock on earth, when he was now to depart hence, as all the Apoſtles expected one to

be

he chosen to succeed him in his care, so did he notwithstanding his own invisible presence and providence over his flock, publickly appoint one. And when he taught them, that he who was greatest among them should be as the least, he did not deny but suppose one greater; and taught in one and the same breath, both that he was over them, and for what he was over them, namely to feed, not to tyrannize; not to domineer and hurt, but to direct, comfort, and conduct his flock in all humility and tenderness, as a servant of all their spiritual necessities; and if a Bishop be otherwise affected, it is the fault of his Person not his place.

And what is it that you would prove hereby? is it that *Bishops are above Ministers*, which in the words *immediately* foregoing you asserted, and in those *next* ensuing confirm from the *Law of the Land?* is there any tendency in your Discourse towards any such purpose? Nay do not your *self* know that what you seek to *insinuate*, namely the institution of *one supream Pastor* of the whole Catholick Church, *one* of the Apostles to be above and ruler over all the rest of the Apostles, and the *whole Church* besides, is perfectly destructive of the *Hierarchy* of Bishops in *England* as established by Law; and also at once casting down the *main* if not *only* foundation that they plead for their station and order from the *Gospel*. For all *Prelate Protestants* as you call them, assert an equality in *all the Apostles*, and a *superiority* in them, to the 70. *Disciples*, whence by a *parity of reason*, they conclude unto the *superiority of Bishops* over Ministers to be continued in the Church. And are you not a *fair Advocate* for your Cause, and well meet for the reproving of others for not consenting unto them? But waving that which you *little* care for, and are not at all concern-

ed

ed in, let us ſee how you *prove* that which we know you greatly deſire to give ſome countenance unto; that is, an *univerſal viſible Paſtor* over the whole Catholick Church in the place and room of Chriſt himſelf. Firſt, You tell us, *that the Apoſtles expected one to be choſen to ſucceed Chriſt in his care.* But to have one *ſucceed* another in his care, infers, that that other *ceaſed* to take and exerciſe the Care which formerly he had and exerciſed; which in this caſe is highly *blaſphemous* once to imagine. I wiſh you would take more *Care* of what you ſay in things of this nature; and not ſuffer the *impetuous byaſs* of your intereſt to caſt you upon expreſſions ſo injurious to the *honour* of Chriſt, and *ſafety* of his Church. And how do you prove that the Apoſtles had any *ſuch expectations* as that which you mention? Our Saviour gave them *equal commiſſion* to teach all Nations, told them that as his father had *ſent him*, ſo he *ſent them*; that he had choſen them *twelve*, but that one of them was a *Devil*: never that one of them ſhould be *Pope*. Their Inſtitution, Inſtruction, Priviledges, Charge, Calling, were all equal. How then ſhould they come to have this *expectation* that one of them ſhould be choſen to *ſucceed Chriſt* in his Care, when they were all choſen to *ſerve under* him in the *continuance* of his *care* towards his Church? That which you obſcurely intimate from whence this *expectation* of yours might ariſe, is the *conteſt* that was amongſt them about *preheminence*, Luk. 22. 24. *There was a ſtrife amongſt them which of them ſhould be the greateſt.* This you ſuppoſe was upon their perſwaſion that *one* ſhould be *choſen* in particular to *ſucceed the Lord Chriſt in his Care*, whereupon they fell into difference about the place. But 1. Is it not ſomewhat ſtrange unto your ſelf, how

how they ſhould conteſt about *a ſucceſſion* unto Chriſt in his abſence, who had not once thought that he would ever be *abſent* from them, nor could bear the mention of it without great ſorrow of heart when afterwards he began to acquaint them with it? 2. How ſhould they come in your apprehenſion to *quarrel* about that which as you ſuppoſe and contend, was *ſomewhile before determined?* For this conteſt of yours, was ſomewhile after the promiſe of *the Keys to Peter*, and the ſaying of Chriſt that he *would build his Church on the Rock*. Were the Apoſtles think you as *ſtupid* as Proteſtants, that they could not ſee the *Supremacy of Peter* in thoſe paſſages, but muſt yet fall at variance who ſhould be *Pope?* 3. How doth it appear that this *ſtrife* of theirs who ſhould be *greateſt*, did not ariſe from their apprehenſion of an *earthly Kingdom*, a hope whereof according to the then current perſwaſion of the *Judaical Church*, to be erected by their maſter whom they believed in as the true Meſſiah, they were not delivered from, until *after his Reſurrection*, when they were filled with the Spirit of the New Teſtament? *Act.* 1. Certainly from that root ſprang the ambitious deſire of the *Sons of Zebedee*, after preheminence in his Kingdom; and the deſigning of the reſt of them in this place from the manner of its management, *by ſtrife*, ſeems to have had no better a ſpring. 4. The *ſtop* put by our Lord Jeſus unto the *ſtrife* that was amongſt them, makes it manifeſt that it aroſe from no ſuch *expectation* as you imagine; or that at leaſt if it did, yet your *expectation* was irregular, vain, and groundleſs. For, 1. He tells them that there ſhould *be no ſuch greatneſs* in his Church, as that which they contended about, being like to the *Soveraignty* exerciſed by, and in the Nations of the earth, from which

which he that can ſhew a difference in your *Papal* Rule, *erit mihi magnus Apollo.* 2. He tells them, that his Father had equally *provided a Kingdom*, that is heavenly and eternal, for all them that believed, which was the *only greatneſs* that they ought to look or enquire after. 3. That as to their *Priviledge* in his Kingdom, it ſhould *be equal* unto them all, for they *ſhould all ſit on Thrones, judging the twelves tribes of Iſrael*; ſo aſcribing equal power, Authority and dignity unto them all; which utterly overthrows the figment of the ſupremacy of any *one* of them over the reſt, *Luk.* 22. 30. *Matth.* 19. 28. And 4. Yet further to prevent any ſuch conceit as that which you ſuppoſe them to have had concerning the *prelation* of any one of them, he tells them that *one* was their *Maſter*, even Chriſt, and *that all they were brethren*, Mat. 23. 8. ſo giving them to underſtand, that he had deſigned them to be perfectly & every way *equal* among themſelves. So ill have you layed the foundation of your Plea, as that it guides us to a *full determination* of the contrary to your pretence, and that given by our *Saviour* himſelf, with many reaſons perſwading his Diſciples of the *equity* of it, and unto an acquieſcency in it. And what you add, that he *preſently appointed one to the preheminence* you imagine, is altogether *inconſiſtent* with what you would conclude from the ſtriſe about it. For the appointment you *fancy*, preceded this *contention*, and had it been real, and to any ſuch purpoſe, would certainly have prevented it. Thus you do neither prove from the *Goſpel* what you *pretend* unto, namely *that Biſhops are above Miniſters*, ſo well do you plead your Cauſe, nor what you *intend*, namely *that the Pope is appointed over them all.* Only you wiſely add a caution about what *a Biſhop* ought

to

to be and do *de jure*, and what any one of them may do or be *de facto*; becauſe it is impoſſible for any man to find the leaſt difference between the domination which our *Saviour* expreſly *condemns*, and that which your *Pope* doth *exerciſe*; Although I know not whither you would think meet to have him deveſted of that *Authority* on the pretence whereof he ſo *domineers* in the world.

Finding your ſelf *deſtitute* of any countenance from the *Goſpel*, you proceed to the *Laws of the Land*. To what purpoſe? to prove that Chriſt appointed *one amongſt his Apoſtles to preſide with plenitude of Power over all the reſt of them*, and conſequently over the whole Catholick Church, *ſucceeding him in his care*? certainly you will find little countenance in our Laws to this purpoſe. But let us hear your own words again. *As for the Laws of the Land*, ſay you, *it is there moſt ſtrongly decreed by the conſent and Authority of the whole Kingdom, not only that Biſhops are our Miniſters, but that the Kings Majeſty is head of the Biſhops alſo in the line of Hierarchy, from whoſe hand they receive both their places and jurisdiction. This was eſtabliſhed not only by one, but by ſeveral Parliament Acts, both in the reign of King* Edward, *and Queen* Elizabeth. What will hence follow? that there is *one univerſal Biſhop* appointed to ſucceed Chriſt in his Care over the Church Catholick, the thing you attempted to *prove* in the words immediately foregoing? Do not the ſame *Laws* which aſſert the order you mention, exclude that which you would introduce? Or would you prove that Biſhops by the *Law of this Land* have a juriſdiction ſuperior unto Miniſters? who ever went about to deny it? or what will the remembrance of it advance your pretenſions? And yet neither is this

fairly

fairly expreſſed by you. For as no Proteſtants aſſert the *King* to be in his power and office interpoſed between Chriſt and Biſhops or Miniſters, as to their *miniſterial office* which is purely ſpiritual, ſo the power of ſupream Juriſdiction which they aſcribe unto him, is not as you falſly inſinuate, *granted* unto him, by the *Laws of King* Edward *and Queen* Elizabeth, but is an inſeparable Priviledge of his Imperial Crown, exerciſed by his Royal Predeceſſours, and aſſerted by them againſt the intruſions and uſurpations of the Pope of *Rome*; only *declared* by thoſe and other Laws. But I perceive you have another deſign in hand. You are entring upon a *diſcourſe* wherein you compare your ſelves not only with *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, but *Prelate Proteſtants* alſo, in what you aſcribe unto *Kings in Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, preferring your ſelves before and above them all. What juſt cauſe you have ſo to do, we ſhall afterwards conſider. Your *Confidence* in it, at firſt view, preſents its ſelf unto us. For whereas there was not in the *Animadverſions* any occaſion of it adminiſtred unto you, and your ſelf confeſs that your *whole diſcourſe about it is beſides your purpoſe*, pag. 66. yet waving almoſt every thing that was incumbent upon you to have *inſiſted* on, if you would not plainly have appeared *vadimonium deſeruiſſe*, and to have given up your *Fiat* as indefenſible, you divert into a long *harangue* about it. The *Theſis* you would by various floriſhes give countenance unto is this. That *Papiſts* in their deference unto Kings, even in Eccleſiaſtical matters, and in their principles of their obedience unto them, *do exceed Proteſtants* of all ſorts. That this is not to our preſent purpoſe, your ſelf cannot but ſee and acknowledge. However your Diſcourſe ſuch as it is, relating to one

ſpecial head of Difference between us, ſhall be a part conſidered by its ſelf in our next Chapter.

CHAP. 16.

The Power aſſigned by Papiſts and Proteſtants unto Kings in matters Eccleſiaſtical. Their ſeveral Principles diſcuſſed and compared.

YOur Diſcourſe on this head is not reducible by *Logick* its ſelf unto any *method* or rules of Argument. For it is in general, 1. So *looſe, Ambiguous* and Metaphorically expreſſed: 2. So *Sophiſtical* and inclusive; 3. So *inconſiſtent* in ſundry inſtances with the Principles and practices of your Church, if you ſpeak intelligibly; 4. So *falſe* and untrue in many particulars, that it is ſcarcely for theſe *excellent qualifications* to be paralleld with any thing either in your *Fiat* or your *Epiſtola*. Firſt, It is *looſe and ambiguous*: 1. Not ſtating what you intend by the *Head of the Church*, which you diſcourſe about: 2. Not *determining* whither the King be ſuch an head of Execution in matter of Religion, as may uſe the Liberty of his *own judgement* as to what he puts in execution, or whether he be not *bound* to execute your Popes Determinations on the penalty of the *forfeiture of his Chriſtianity*; which I doubt we ſhall find to be your opinion; 3. Not *declaring* wherein the power which you aſſign unto him is founded; whether in *Gods immediate inſtitution*, or the Conceſſion of the Pope, whereon it ſhould ſolely depend, unto whom it is in all things to be made ſubſervient. Secondly, *Sophiſtical.* (1.) In playing with the ambiguity of that expreſſion *Head*

of

of the Church, and by the advantage thereof impoſing on Proteſtants *contradictions* between their profeſſion and practice, as though in the one they acknowledged the King to *be head of the Church*, and not in the other: (whereas there is a perfect conſonancy between them in the ſence wherein they underſtand that expreſſion) ſhrowding your own ſence and opinion in the mean time under the ſame ambiguity. (2.) In *ſuppoſing* an abſolute univerſal Head of the whole Catholick Church, and then giving reaſons why *no King* can be that Head; when you know that the whole Queſtion is whither there be *any ſuch head* of the Catholick Church on earth or no. (3.) In *ſuppoſing* the Principles and practiſes of the *Primitive Church* to have been the ſame with thoſe of the preſent *Roman*, and thoſe of the preſent *Roman* to have been all known and allowed of old, which begs all that is in Controverſie between us; and ſundry other inſtances of the like nature may be obſerved in it. Thirdly, *Inconſiſtent* with the Principles and Practices of your own Church, both 1. In what you *aſcribe* unto Kings, and 2. In your ſtating of the power and Juriſdiction of your Pope, if the ambiguity of your words and expreſſions will allow us to conclude what you intend or aim at. Fourthly, *Falſe*. (1.) In matter of fact, as to what you relate of the *obedience* of your Church unto Kings. (2.) In the *principles* and Opinions which you impoſe on your Adverſaries; (3.) In the *declaration* that you make of your own; and (4.) In many particular Aſſertions whoſe conſideration will afterwards occur.

This is a buſineſs I could have been glad you had not *neceſſitated* me to the Conſideration of; for it cannot be truly and diſtinctly handled, without ſome

ſuch *reflections* upon your Church and way, as may without extraordinary indulgence redound unto your diſadvantage. Your have by your own *voluntary choice* called me to the diſcuſſion of thoſe Principles which have created you *much trouble* in theſe Nations, and put you oftentimes upon attempting their diſquiet. Now theſe are things which I deſire not. I am but a *private man*, and am very well contented you ſhould enjoy all that peace and liberty which you think not meet in other Nations where the Power is at your diſpoſal, to grant unto them that diſſent from you. *Lex talionis* ſhould be far from influencing the minds of Chriſtians in this matter: however the equity of it may at any time be pleaded or urged to relieve others in other places, under bondage and perſecution. But I am ſure, if I judge your proceedings againſt other men *diſſenting* from you in Conſcience, to be unjuſtifiable by the Scripture, or Light of Nature, or ſuffrage of the Antient Church, as I do, I have no reaſon to deſire that they ſhould be drawn into preſident againſt their ſelves, in any place in the world. And therefore Sir, had you provided the beſt colour you could for your *own Principles*, and palliated them to the utmoſt, ſo to hide them from the eyes of thoſe, who it may be are ready to ſeek their diſturbance and trouble from an apprehenſion of the evil that may enſue upon them, and had not ſet them up in compariſon with the *Principles of Proteſtants* of all ſorts, and for the ſetting off your own with the better grace and luſter, untruly and individiouſly reported theirs, to expoſe them unto thoſe thoughts, and that ſeverity from ſupream powers which you ſeek your ſelves to wave, I ſhould have wholly paſſed by this diſcourſe, unto which no occaſion was adminiſtred

in

in the *Animadverſions*; but now as you have handled the matter, unleſs I would have it taken for granted that the Principles of the *Roman Church*, are more ſuited unto the eſtabliſhment and promotion of the *intereſt and Soveraignty* of Kings and other ſupream Magiſtrates, and in particular the Kings of theſe Nations, then thoſe of *Proteſtants*. which in Truth I do not believe, I muſt of neceſſity make a little further enquiry into your Diſcourſe. And I deſire your pardon, if in my ſo doing, any thing be ſpoken that ſuits not ſo well your intereſt and deſigns, neither expecting nor deſiring any, if ought be delivered by me not according to Truth.

To make our way the more clear, ſome of the *ambiguous expreſſions* which you make uſe of to cloud and hide your intention in your enquiry after the *Head of the Church*, muſt be explained.

1. By the *Church*, you underſtand, not this, or that particular Church, not the Church of this or that Nation, Kingdom, or Countrey, but the *whole Catholick Church* throughout the world. And when you have explained your ſelf to this purpoſe you endeavour by *ſix Arguments*, (no leſs, p. 67, 68.) to prove that *no King* ever was or can be Head of it. He ſaid well of old,

In cauſa facili quemvis licet eſſe diſertum.

I wonder you contented your ſelf to give us *ſix Reaſons* only, and that you proceeded not at leaſt unto the high hills *of eighteenthly and nineteenthly*, that you talk of in your *Fiat Lux* where you ſcoff at the *preaching of Presbyterians*; it may be you will ſcarely ever obtain ſuch another opportunity of ſhewing the fertility of your invention. So did he floriſh who thought himſelf ſecure from adverſaries.

Caput altum in prælia tollit,
Oſtenditq́, humeros latos, alternaq; jactat
Brachia protendens, & verberat ictibus auras.

But you do like him, you only *beat the ayre*; Do you think any man was ever ſo *diſtempered* as to dream that any *King* whatever could be *the abſolute Head of the whole Catholick Church of Chriſt?* we no more think *any King* in any ſence to be the Head of the Catholick Church, then we think the *Pope* ſo to be. The *Roman Empire* was at its hight and glory when firſt Chriſtianity ſet forth in the world, and had extended its bounds beyond thoſe of any Kingdom that aroſe *before* it, or that hath ſince *ſucceeded* unto it. And yet within a very few years, after the *Reſurrection* of Chriſt, the Goſpel had diffuſed it ſelf beyond the limits of that Empire, among the *Parthians*, and *Indians*, and unto *Britannorum Romanis inacceſſa loca*, as *Tertullian* calls them. Now none ever ſuppoſed that any *King* had power or Authority of any ſort in reference unto the Church, or any *members of it*, without or beyond the preciſe limits of his own *Dominions*. The Enquiry we have under Conſideration about the *Power of Kings*, and the obedience due unto them in Eccleſiaſtical things, is limited abſolutely unto their own Kingdoms, and unto thoſe of their ſubjects which are Chriſtians in them. And this

Hi motus animorum atq; hæc certamina tanta
Pulveris exigui jactu concuſſa quieſcunt.

A little obſervation of this one known and granted Principle, renders not only your *ſix Reaſons* altogether uſeleſs, but ſuperſedes alſo a great part of *your Rhetorick*, which under the ambiguity of

of that expreſſion you diſplay in your whole Diſcourſe.

Secondly, You pleaſantly lead about your *unwary Reader* with the ambiguity of the other term, *the Head*. Hence *p.* 58. you fall into a great exclamation againſt Proteſtants, *that acknowledging the King to be the Head of the Church, they do not ſupplicate unto him, and acquieſce in his judgement in Religious affairs*, as if ever any Proteſtant acknowledged *any King* or any mortal man to be *ſuch an Head* of the Church as you fancy to your ſelves, in whoſe determinations in Religion all men are bound *ſpiritually* and as to their eternal concernments to acquieſce; and that not becauſe they are *true* according to the Scripture, but becauſe they are *his*. Such an *Head* you make the *Pope*; ſuch an one on earth all Proteſtants deny, which evacuates your whole Diſcourſe to that purpoſe, *p.* 58, 59. It is true in oppoſition unto your *Papal claim* of Authority and Jurisdiction over the ſubjects of this Kingdom, Proteſtants do aſſert the King to be *ſo Head* of the Church within his own Realms and Dominions, as that he is by Gods appointment the *ſole fountain* and ſpring amongſt men of all Authority and Power to be exerciſed over the Perſons of his ſubjects in matters of external cognizance and order; being no way obnoxious to the direction, ſuperviſorſhip and ſuperintendency of any other, in particular not of the Pope. He is not only the *only ſtriker* as you phraſe it, in his Kingdoms, but the only *Protector* under God of all his ſubjects, and the only *Diſtributor* of Juſtice in rewards and puniſhments unto them, not depending in the adminiſtration of the *one* or other on the determinations or orders of your *Pope* or Church. Not that any of them do uſe abſolutely

that expreſſion *of Head of the Church*, but that they aſcribe unto him, all *Authority* that ought or can be exerciſed in his Dominions over any of his Subjects whither in things *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical*, that are not *meerly Spiritual*, and to be *miniſterially* ordered in obedience unto Chriſt Jeſus: And that you may the better ſee what it is that *Proteſtants* aſcribe unto the King, and to every King that is Abſolutely ſupream, as his *Majeſty* is, in his own Dominions, and withall, how exceeding vain your unreaſonable reproach is, which you caſt upon them for not giving themſelves up unto an abſolute *acquieſcency* in humane determinations as meerly ſuch, on pretence that they proceed from the Head of the Church; I ſhall give you a brief account of their thoughts in this whole matter.

Firſt, They ſay, that the *King is the ſupream Governor over all Perſons* whatever, within his Realms and Dominions, none being exempted on any account from ſubjection unto his Regal Authority. How well you approve of this *Propoſition* in the great aſſignations you pretend unto *Kingly power* we ſhall afterwards enquire. Proteſtants found their perſwaſion in this matter, on the *Authority* of the Scripture both Old Teſtament and New, and the very Principles conſtituting Soveraign Power amongſt men. You ſpeak fair to Kings, but at firſt daſh *exempt* a conſiderable number of their born ſubjects owing them *indiſpenſible* natural Allegiance, from their juriſdiction. Of this ſort are the Clergy. But the Kings of *Judah* of old were not of your mind. *Solomon* certainly thought *Abiathar* though High Prieſt ſubject to his Royal Authority, when he denounced againſt him a ſentence of death, and actually depoſed him from the *Prieſthood*. The like courſe did

did his ſucceſſors proceed in. For neither had God in the firſt *proviſion* he made for a King amongſt his people, *Deut.* 18. nor in that *preſcription* of the manner of the Kingdom which he gave them by *Samuel*, once intimated an exemption of any perſons, *Prieſts* or others from the Rule or Authority of the Prince, which he would ſet over them. In the *New Teſtament* we have the Rule, as the practice in the Old, Rom. 13. *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the Higher Powers*, the power that bears the ſword, *the ſtriker*. And we think that your Clergy men have ſouls (at leaſt *pro ſale*) and ſo come within the circumference of this Command and Rule. *Chryſoſtome* in his Comment on that place is of our mind, and prevents your pretence of an *exception* from the Rule by *ſpecial Priviledge*, giving us a diſtribution of the univerſality of the Perſons here intended into their ſeveral kinds. Δεικνὺς ſaith he, ὅτι πᾶσι διατάττεται καὶ ἱερεῦσι καὶ μοναχοῖς, ἀγχιτοῖς βιωτικοῖς οὖσιν· ἐκ προοιμίων αὐτὸ δῆλον ἐποίησεν, ὅταν λέγων· πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. κἂν ἀπόστολος ᾖ, κἂν εὐαγγελιστὴς, κἂν προφήτης, κἂν ὁτιοῦν. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀναιρεῖται τὴν εὐσεβείαν αὕτη ἡ ὑποταγὴ, καὶ οὐ ἁπλῶς εἶπε πειθέσθω, ἀλλ' ὑποτασσέσθω. *He ſheweth that theſe things are commanded unto all, unto Prieſts and Monks, and not to ſecular perſons only, which he declareth in the very entrance of his Diſcourſe, ſaying Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers; whither thou be an Apoſtle, or an Evangeliſt, or a Prophet, or whatever thou be. For ſubjection overthrows not Piety. And he ſaith not ſimply, Let him obey, but let him be ſubject.* The very ſame inſtances are given by *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, and *Theophilact*. *Bernard*, Epiſt. 42. ad *Archiepiſc. Senonenſ.* meets with your *exception* which in his dayes began

began to be broached in the world, and tells you expreſly that it is a *deluſion*. In conformity unto this Rule of St. *Paul*, *Peter* exhorts *all Chriſtians*, none excepted, to *ſubmit themſelves unto the King as Supreme*, 1 Epiſt. ch. 2. 13. And what ever we conclude from theſe words in reference unto the *King*, I fear that if inſtead of the *King*, he had ſaid *the Pope*, you would have thought us very *impudent*, if we had perſiſted in the denyal of your *monſtrous imaginary* Headſhip. But in this *Principle*, on theſe and the like grounds do all Proteſtants concur. And indeed to fancy a *Soveraign Monarch* with ſo great a number of men as *your Clergy* conſiſts of in many Kingdoms exempted from his regal Authority, is to lay ſuch an ax unto the root of his Government, as whereby with one ſtroke you may *hew* it down at your pleaſure.

2. Proteſtants affirm, that *Rex in regno ſuo*, every King in his own Kingdom is the *Supreme diſpenſer of Juſtice and Judgement unto all Perſons, in all Cauſes* that belong unto, or are determinable *in foro exteriori* in any Court of Judicature, whither the matter which they concern be *Civil* or *Eccleſiaſtical*. No Cauſe, no difference determinable by any Law of man, and to be determined by *Coercive Umpirage* or Authority, is exempted from his cognizance. Neither can any man, on any pretence, claim any *Juriſdiction* over any of his Subjects not directly and immediately derived from him. Neither can any King, who is a *Soveraign Monarch*, like the Kings of this Land, yield or grant a power in any other to judge of any *Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes* among his Subjects, as ariſing from any other *Spring*, or growing on any other root but that of his own Authority, without an impeachment and irreparable prejudice

to

to his Crown and Dignity: neither doth any ſuch *Conceſſion*, grant or ſuppoſition make it indeed ſo to be, but is a meer fiction and miſtake, all that is done upon it, being *ipſo facto* null, and of none effect. Neither if a *King* ſhould make a *pretended legal* grant of ſuch power unto any, would any *right* accrew unto them thereby; the making of ſuch a Grant being a matter *abſolutely* out of his power, as are all things whereby his regal Authority, wherein the Majeſty of his Kingdom is enwrapped, may be *diminiſhed*. For that King, who hath a power to diminiſh *his Kingly Authority*, never was intruſted with *abſolute Kingly Power*. Neither is this Power granted unto our Kings by the *Acts of Parliament*, which you mention made in the beginning of the Reformation; but was alwayes *inherent* in them, and exerciſed in innumerable inſtances, and often vindicated with an high hand from *Papal encroachments*, even during the hour and power of your darkneſs, as hath been ſufficiently proved by many, both *Divines* and *Lawyers*. Things of *meer ſpiritual order* as *preaching the word*, *Adminiſtration* of the Sacraments and the like, we aſcribe not unto *Kings*, nor the communicating of power unto any for their performance. The Soveraign Power of theſe things, is *veſted* in Chriſt alone, and by him committed unto his *Miniſters*. But Religion hath many concernments that attend it, which muſt be deſpoſed of by *forenſical*, *juridical* proceſs and and determinations. All theſe with the Perſons of them, that are intereſted in them, are ſubject *immediately* to the power and Authority of the King, and none other; and to exempt them, or any of them, or any of the like nature, which may *emerge* amongſt men in things relating unto Conſcience

ence and Religion, whose *Catalogue* may be endlesly extended, from *Royal Cognizance*, is to make meer properties of Kings in things which in a very special manner concern the peace and wellfare of their subjects, and the distribution of rewards and punishments among them. Of this sort are all things that concern the authoritative *publick Conventions of Church Officers*, and differences amongst them about their interests, practices, and publick profession of Doctrines, Collations of Legal Dignities and Benefices, by and with investitures *legal* and valid, all *Ecclesiastical revenews* with their incidencies, the *Courts* and *Jurisdictions* of *Ecclesiastical Persons* for the reiglement of the outward man by Censures and Sentences of Law, with the like. And as this whole matter is sufficiently confirmed by what was spoken before of the Power of Kings over the Persons of all their Subjects, and (for to what end should they have such a power, if in respect of many of them, and that in the chief concernments of their rule and Government, it may never be exerted?) so I should tire your patience, if I should report one half of the *Laws*, Instances and *Pleas*, made, given and used, by the *Antient* Christian Kings and Emperours in the persuit, and for the Confirmation of this their just power. The Decrees and Edicts of *Constantine* the Great, commanding, ruling and disposing of *Bishops* in Cases Ecclesiastical, the Laws of *Justinian*, *Charls* the Great, *Ludovicus* his Son, and *Lotharius* his Successor, with more innumerable to the same purpose are extant and known unto all. So also are the *Pleas*, *Protestations* and Vindications of most of the Kingdoms of *Europe* after once the pretensions of Papacy began to be broached to their prejudice. And in particular, notable

notable inſtances you might have, of the exerciſe of this *royal power* in the firſt Chriſtian Magiſtrate inveſted with ſupreme Authority, both in the caſe of *Athanaſius*, *Socrat. Lib.* 1. *cap.* 28. *& cap.* 34. *Athan. Apol.* 2. as alſo of the *Donatiſts*, *Euſeb. lib.* 10. *cap.* 5. *Auguſt. Epiſt.* 162, 166. and *adverſ. Creſcon. lib.* 3 *c.* 17. whereunto innumerable inſtances in his Succeſſors may be added.

3. Proteſtants teach unanimouſly, that it is *incumbent* on Kings to find out, receive, embrace and promote the Truth of the Goſpel, and the Worſhip of God appointed therein, confirming, protecting and defending of it, by their *Regal Power* and Authority: as alſo that in their ſo doing, they are to uſe the Liberty of their *own judgements* informed by the wayes that God hath appointed for that end, independently on the dictates, determinations and orders of any other Perſon or Perſons in the world, unto whoſe *Authority* they ſhould be obnoxious. *Heathen Kings* made Laws for God, *Dan.* 3. *chap.* 6. *Jona* 3. And the great thing that we find any of the *Good Kings of Judah* commended for is, that they *commanded the Worſhip of God to be obſerved* and performed, according unto his own appointment. For this end were they then *bound to write out a Copy of the Law with their own hands*, *Deut.* 14. 18. and to ſtudy in it continually. To this purpoſe were they warned, charged, exhorted and excited by the Prophets; that is, that they ſhould *ſerve God as Kings*. And to this purpoſe are there *innumerable Laws* of the beſt Chriſtian Kings and Emperours ſtill extant in the world.

In theſe things conſiſts that *Supremacy or Headſhip of Kings* which Proteſtants *unanimouſly* aſcribe unto them; eſpecially thoſe in *England*, to his Royal Majeſty.

Majeſty. And from hence you may ſee the frivoloufneſs of ſundry things you object unto them.

As firſt of the *Scheme* or Series of *Eccleſiaſtical Power* which you aſcribe to *Prelate Proteſtants*, and the Laws of the Land, from which you ſay, the *Presbyterians* diſſent, which you thus expreſs;

By the Laws of our Land, our Series of Government Eccleſiaſtical ſtands thus,
God,
Chriſt,
King,
Biſhop,
Miniſters,
People.

The Presbyterian Predicament is thus,
God,
Chriſt,
Miniſter,
People.

So that the Miniſters head in the Presbyterian Predicament toucheth Chriſts feet immediately and nothing intervenes. You pretend indeed that hereby you do exalt Chriſt, but this is a meer cheat as all men may ſee with their eyes. For Chriſt is but where he was, but the Miniſter indeed is exalted, being now ſet in the Kings place one degree higher then the Biſhops, who by Law is under King and Biſhops too.

If I miſtake not in my gueſs, you greatly pleaſed your ſelf with your *Scheme*, wherein you pretend to make forſooth an *ocular Demonſtration* of what you undertook to prove; whereas indeed it is as *trivial* a fancy as a man can ordinarily meet withal. For 1. Neither the *Law*, nor *Prelates*, nor *Presbyterians* aſcribe any place at all unto the *Kings Majeſty* in the Series of *Spiritual Order*; he is neither Biſhop, nor Miniſter, nor Deacon, or any way authorized by Chriſt to convey or communicate power *meerly ſpiritual* unto any others. No ſuch thing is *claimed* by our Kings, or *declared* in Law, or *aſſerted* by Proteſtants of any ſort. But in the *ſeries* of exteriour

teriour Government, both *Prelate Proteſtants* and *Presbyterians* aſſign a Supremacy over all Perſons in his Dominions, and that in all Cauſes that are inquirable and determinable by, or in any Court exerciſing Juriſdiction and Authority, unto his Majeſty. All ſorts aſſign unto him the Supreme place under Chriſt in *external Government* and Juriſdiction. None aſſign him any place in Spiritual Order and meerly Spiritual Power. Secondly, If you place Biſhops on the *Series* of exterior Government as appointed by the King and confirmed by the Law of the Land, there is yet *no difference* with reſpect unto them. 3. The Queſtion then is ſolely about the Series of *Spiritual order*, and thereabout it is confeſſed there are various apprehenſions of Proteſtants, which is all you prove, and ſo do, *magno conatu nugas agere*: who knows it not? I wiſh there were any need to prove it: But Sir, this difference about the Superiority of *Biſhops* to *Presbyters*, or their *equality*, or *Identity*, was agitated in the Church many and many a hundred year before you or I were born, and will be ſo probably when we are both dead and forgotten. So that what it makes in this diſpute, is very hard for a ſober man to conjecture. 4. Who they are that pretend to *exalt Chriſt*, by a meer *aſſerting Miniſters*, not to be by his inſtitution ſubject to Biſhops, which you call a *cheat*, I know not, nor ſhall be their advocate; they exalt Chriſt who love him and keep his Commandments, and no other.

2. You may alſo as eaſily diſcern the *frivolouſneſs* of your exclamation againſt *Proteſtants* for not giving up their differences in Religion to the *Umpirage* of Kings upon the aſſignment of that *Supremacy* unto them which hath been declared. When

we

we make the *King* ſuch an Head of the *Catholick Church* as you make the *Pope*, we ſhall ſeek unto him as the fountain of our faith, as you pretend to do unto the Pope. For the preſent we give *that honour* to none but Chriſt himſelf; and for what we aſſign in profeſſion unto the King, we anſwer it wholly in our practical ſubmiſſion. Proteſtants never *thought*, nor *ſaid* that any King was appointed by Chriſt to be ſupreme *infallible Propoſer* of all things to be believed and done in the Worſhip of God; no King ever aſſumed that power unto himſelf. It is Jeſus Chriſt alone who is the *Supreme and abſolute Lawgiver* of his Church, the Author and finiſher of our Faith; and it is the honour of Kings to ſerve him in the promotion of his Intereſt, by the exerciſe of that Authority and duty which we have before declared. What unto the dethroning and diſhonour as much as in you lyeth of Chriſt himſelf, and of *Kings* alſo, you aſſign unto the *Pope*, in making him the *Supreme head* and *fountain of their faith*, hath been already conſidered. This is the ſubſtance of what you except againſt *Proteſtants* either as to Opinion or Practice in this matter of *deference* unto Kingly Authority in things Eccleſiaſtical. What is the ſenſe of your Church which you prefer unto your *ſentiments* herein, I ſhall after I have a little examined your preſent pretenſions manifeſt unto you, (*ſeeing you will have it ſo,*) from thoſe who are full well able to inform us of it;

Fas mihi Pontificum ſacrata reſolvere jura,
——— atq; omnia ferre ſub auras,
Siqua tegunt; teneat Romæ nec legibus ullis.

For your own part you have expreſſed your ſelf in

in this matter ſo *looſely*, *generally* and *ambiguouſly*, that it is very hard for any man to collect from your words, what it is that you aſſert, or what you deny. I ſhall endeavour to draw out your ſenſe by a few enſquiries. As 1. Do yon think the *King* hath *any Authority* veſted in him *as King* in Eccleſiaſtical affairs, and over Eccleſiaſtical Perſons? You tell us, *That Catholicks obſerve the King in all things as well Eccleſiaſtick as Civil*, pag. 59. that in the line of *Corporal power and Authority the King is immediately under God*, p. 61. with other words to the ſame purpoſe, if they are to any purpoſe at all. I deſire to know whither you grant in him an *Authority* derived immediately from God in and over *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, as to convene *Synods* or Councils, to reform things amiſs in the Church, as to the outward adminiſtration of them? or do you think that he hath ſuch power and Authority to *make*, *conſtitute* or appoint Laws with penal Sanctions in and about things Eccleſiaſtical? And Secondly, Do you think that in the work which he hath to do for the Church, be it what it will, he may uſe the *liberty of his own judgement* directed by the light of the Scripture, or that he is *preciſely* to follow the declarations and determinations of the Pope? If he have not this *Authority*, if he may not uſe *this liberty*, the good words you *ſpeak* of *Catholicks*, and *give* unto *him*, ſignifie indeed nothing at all. If then he hath, and may, you openly riſe up againſt the *Bulls*, *Briefs* and *Interdicts* of your Popes themſelves and the univerſal practice of your Church for many Ages. And therefore I deſire you to inform me Thirdly, Whether you do not judge him *abſolutely* to be *ſubject* and *accountable* to the Pope for what ever he doth in *Eccleſiaſtical affairs* in his own Kingdoms and Dominions? if you anſwer ſuitably

to the *Principles*, *Maximes* and practiſe of your Church, you muſt ſay he is; and if ſo, I muſt tell you that whatever you aſcribe unto him in things *Eccleſiaſtical*, he acts not about them *as King*, but in ſome other capacity. For to do a thing as *a King*, and to be accountable for what he doth therein to the *Pope*, implyes a Contradiction. Fourthly, Hath not the *Pope* a power over his Subjects, many of them at leaſt, to convent, cenſure judge and puniſh them, and to exempt them in *Criminal Caſes* from his Juriſdiction? And is not this a *fair Supremacy* that it is meet he ſhould be contented withal, when you put it into the power of another to exempt as many of his Subjects as *he pleaſeth and are willing*, from his Regal Authority? 5. When you ſay, *that in matters of faith, Kings for their own eaſe remit their Subjects to their Papal Paſtor, pag.* 57. Whether you do not collude with us, or indeed do at all think as you ſpeak? Do you think that Kings have *real power* in, and about thoſe things wherein you depend on the Pope, and only *remit* their Subjects to him for their own eaſe? You cannot but know that this one Conceſſion would ruine the whole *Papacy*, as being expreſly deſtructive of all the *foundations* on which it is built. Nor did ever any *Pope* proceed on this ground in his interpoſures in the world about matters of faith; that ſuch things indeed belonged unto others, and were only by them *remitted* unto him for their eaſe. 6. Whether you do not include *Kings themſelves* in your general Aſſertion, pag. 55. *That they who after Papal deciſions remain contumacious forfeit their Chriſtianity?* And if ſo, whether you do not at once overthrow all your other *Splendid Conceſſions*, and make Kings abſolute Dependents on the *Pope* for all the Privi-

ledges

ledges of their Chriſtianity, and whether you account not among them, their very *Regal Dignity* it ſelf? Whereby it may eaſily appear how much *Proteſtant Kings and Potentates* are beholding unto you, ſeeing it is manifeſt that they live and rule in a neglect of many *Papal Deciſions* and Determinations. 7. Whether you do not very fondly pretend to prove your *Roman Catholicks* acknowledgement of the power of Princes to make *Laws in Caſes Eccleſiaſtical*, from the Laws of *Juſtinian*, *p.* 59. whereas they are inſtances of *Regal Power* in ſuch Caſes plainly deſtructive of your preſent *Hildebrandine* faith and Authority: and whether you ſuppoſe ſuch Laws to have any force or Authority of Law, without the *Papal Sanction* and Confirmation? 8. Whither you think indeed that *Confeſſion unto Prieſts* is ſuch an effectual means of *ſecuring the peace* and intereſt of Kings as you pretend, *p.* 59. and whether Queen *Elizabeth*, King *James*, *Henry* the third and fourth of *France* had cauſe to believe it; and whether you learned this notion from *Parry*, *Raviliac*, *Mariana*, *Clement*, *Parſons*, *Allen*, *Garnet*, *Gerard*, *Oldcome*, with their Aſſociates? 9. Whether you forgot not your ſelf when you place *Aaron and Joſhuah in government together? p.* 64. 10. Whether you really believe, that the *Pope* hath Power only to *perſwade in matters of Religion* as you pretend? *p.* 65. and if ſo; from what *Topicks* he takes the *Whips*, *Wires* and *Racks* that he makes uſe of in his *Inquiſition*? And whether he hath not a right even to deſtroy *Kings themſelves*, who will not be his Executioners in deſtroying of others? I wiſh you would come out of the *clouds*, and ſpeak your mind freely and plainly to ſome of theſe enquiries. Your preſent *ambignous diſcourſe*, in the face of it ſuited

unto your intereſt, gives no ſatisfaction, whileſt theſe *ſnakes* lye in the graſs of it. Wherefore leaving you a little to your *ſecond thoughts*, I ſhall enquire of your Maſters and Fathers themſelves, what is the *true ſenſe* of your Church in this matter, and we ſhall find them ſpeaking it out plainly and roundly: For they tell us,

1. That *the Government of the whole Catholick Church is Monarchical*: A State wherein all Power, is derived from one fountain, one and the ſame Perſon. This is the firſt Principle that is laid down by all your Writers, in treating of the Church and its power; and that which your great *Cardinal Baronius* layes as the foundation on whirh he builds the huge Structure of his *Eccleſiaſtical Annals*.

2. *That the Pope is this Monarch of the Church*: the Perſon in whom alone the Soveraign Rule of it is originally veſted: ſo that it is abſolutely impoſſible that any other Perſon ſhould have, enjoy, or uſe any *Eccleſiaſtical Authority*, but what is derived from him. I believe you ſuppoſe this ſufficiently proved by *Bellarmine* or others. Your ſelf own it, nor can deny it without a diſclaimure of your *preſent Papacy*. And this *one Principle* perfectly diſcovers the vanity of your pretended attributions of Power in *Eccleſiaſtical* things to Kings and Princes. For to ſuppoſe a *Monarchical* eſtate, and not to ſuppoſe all Power and Authority in that ſtate to be derived from the *Monarch* in it and of it alone, is to ſuppoſe a *perfect contradiction*, or a State Monarchical that is not Monarchical. Proteſtants place the *Monarchical* State of the Catholick Church in its relation unto *Chriſt* alone: and therefore it is incumbent on them to aſſert that no man hath, or can have a power in the Church as ſuch, but what is derived

derived from and communicated unto him by him. And you placing it in reference unto the *Pope*, muſt of neceſſity deny that any power can be exerciſed in it, but what is derived from him, ſo that whatever you pretend in this kind to grant unto kings, you allow it unto them only by *conceſſion* or delegation from the Pope. They muſt hold it from him in *cheif*, or he cannot be the *chief* only, and abſolute head and Monarch of the Catholick Church which you would perſwade us to believe that he is: Kings then may even in Church affairs be *ſtrikers* under him; be the ſervants and executioners of his will and pleaſure; but *Authority* from God immediately in and about them they have *none*, nor can have any whileſt your *Imaginary* Monarchy takes place. This one *fundamental Principle* of your Religion ſufficiently diſcovers the inſignificancy of your *fliriſh* about Kingly Authority in Eccleſiaſtical things, ſeeing upon a ſuppoſition of it, they can have none at all. But you ſtay not here; for

3. *You aſcribe unto your Popes an univerſal Dominion even in Civil things over all Chriſtian Kings and their ſubjects.* In the explanation of this Dominion, I confeſs you ſomewhat *vary* among your ſelves; but the thing it ſelf is generally aſſerted by you, and made a foundation of practice. Some of you maintain that the *Pope by Divine right and Conſtitution hath an abſolute ſupream Dominion over the whole world.* This opinion, *Bellarmine lib. 5. de Pont. cap. 1.* confeſſeth to be maintained by *Auguſtinus Triumphus, Alvarus, Pelagius, Hoſtienſis*, and *Panormitanus*. And himſelf in the next words condemns the *opinion* of them who deny the Pope to have any ſuch *temporal power*, as that he may *command ſecular Princes*, and deprive them of th

Kingdoms and Principalities, not only *as falſe* but as down right *Hereſie*. And why doth he name the firſt *opinion* as that of *four or five Doctors*, when it is the Common opinion of your Church, as *Baronius* ſufficiently manifeſts in the life of *Gregory the ſeventh*? That great preſerver of your *Pontificial omnipotency* in his *Bull* againſt *Henry* the *German Emperour*, affirms that he hath power *to take away Empires, Kingdoms and Principalities, or what ever a mortal man may have*, as *Platina* records it in his life. As alſo *Pope Nicholas* the ſecond in his Epiſtle *ad Mediolanenſ.* aſſerts, that the rights both of the *heavenly and earthly Empires* are committed unto him. And he that hath but looked on the *Dictates* of the forenamed *Gregory* confirmed in a *Council* at *Rome*, and defended by *Baronius*, or into their *Decretals*, knows that you give *both ſwords* to the Pope, and that over and over. Whence *Carerius*, *Lib.* 1. *c.* 9. affirms that it is the *Common opinion* of the School Divines that the Pope hath *pleniſſimam Poteſtatem*, plenary power over the whole world, both in *Eccleſiaſtical and Temporal* matters; and you know the *old compariſon* made by the *Canoniſts cap. de Major. & Obed.* between the *Pope* and the *Emperour*, namely that *he is as the Sun*, the *Emperour as the Moon*, which borrows all its light from the other. *Bellarmine* and thoſe few whom he follows, or that follow him, maintain that the Pope *hath this Power only indirectly and in order unto ſpiritual things*; the meaning of which aſſertion as he explains himſelf, is, that beſides that *direct power*, which he hath over thoſe Countreys and Kingdoms which on one pretence or other he claims to be *Feandatory* to the Roman See, which are no ſmall number of the chiefeſt Kingdoms of *Europe*, he hath a Power over them all, to *diſpoſe* of

of them, their *Kings* and Rulers, according as he judgeth it to conduce to the *good* and intereſt of the Church: which as it really differs very little from the former opinion, ſo *Barclay* tells us that *Pope Sixtus* was very little pleaſed with that ſeeming depreſſion of the Papal Power, which his words intimate. But the ſtated Doctrine of your Church in this matter is ſo declared by *Bozius*, *Auguſtinus Triumphus*, *Caterius*, *Schioppius*, *Marta* and others, all approved by her Authority, that there can be no queſtion of it. Moreover to make way for the putting of this *indirect* Power into *direct* Execution, you declare,

4. *That the Pope is the ſupream Judge of faith, and his Declarations and Determinations ſo far the Rule of it, as that they are to be received, and finally ſubmitted unto:* not to do ſo, is that which you expreſs *Hereſie*, or *Schiſm*, or *Apoſtacy*. About this Principle alſo of your Profeſſion there have been, as about moſt other things amongſt you, great Diſputes and wranglings between the Doctors and props of your Church. Much debate there hath been whither *this power* be to be attributed unto the *Pope without* a Council, or *above* a Council, or *againſt* one. About theſe *Chimara's* are whole volumes filled with *keen* and ſubtil argumentations. But the *Popes Perſonal*, or at leaſt *Cathedral* Determination hath at length prevailed. For whatever ſome few of you may *whiſper* unto your own *trouble* and diſadvantage, to the impeachment of his *Perſonal Infallibility*, you are eaſily decryed by the general voice of your Doctors; and beſides thoſe very perſons themſelves, wherever they would place the *Infallibility* of the Church that they fancy, are forced to put it ſo far into the *Popes* hand and management, as that whatever *he determines* with the neceſ-

ſary ſolemnities in matters of faith, is ultimately at leaſt to be acquieſced in. So your *ſelf aſſure* us, averring that he who doth not ſo, *forfeits his Chriſtianity*. and conſequently all the Priviledges which thereby he enjoyes; and we have reaſon ſufficient from former experience to believe that the *Pope* have he ability unto his will, is ready enough to take the forfeiture. Whither upon a Princes falling into *Hereſie*, in not acquieſcing in your *Papal determinations*, his ſubjects are diſcharged *ipſo facto* from all obedience unto him, as *Dominicus Bannes* and others maintain, or whither there needs the *Denunciation* of a ſentence againſt him by the *Pope* for their abſolution, you are not agreed. But yet

5. *You affirm that in Caſe of ſuch Diſobedience unto the Pope, he is armed with Power to depoſe Kings and Princes, and to give away, and beſtow their Kingdoms and Dominions on others*; Innumerable are the inſtances whereby the Popes themſelves have juſtified their *claim* of this Power in the face of the world, and it were endleſs to recount the *Emperours*, *Kings*, and free Princes that they have attempted to ruine and deſtroy, (in the perſuit of ſome wherof they actually ſucceeded) with the deſolations of Nations that have enſued thereon. I ſhall mention but one and that given us in the dayes of *our Fathers*, and it may be in the memory of ſome yet alive. *Pope Pius* V takes upon him contrary to the advice and entreaties of the Emperour of *Germany* and others, to depoſe *Queen Elizabeth*, and to devote her to deſtruction. To this end he *abſolved all her Subjects* from their Allegiance, and gave away her *Kingdoms* and Dominions to the *Spaniard*, aſſiſting him to his utmoſt in his attempt to take poſſeſſion of his grant: and all for refuſing obedience

to

to the See of *Rome*. You cannot I preſume be offended with my mention of that which is known unto all, for theſe things *were not done in a corner*. And is it not hence evident that all the power which you grant unto Kings, is meerly *precarious*, which they hold of your Pope as *Tenants* at will? and ſhould they not appear to do ſo, were his force, wit and courage anſwerable to his will and pretence of Authority? But be it that becauſe you cannot help it, you *ſuffer* them to live at peace and quietneſs in the main of their *Rule*, yet you ſtill *curb* them in their own Dominions; for

6. *You exempt all the Clergy from under their Rule and Power*. See your *Bellarmine ſweating* to prove that they are not bound to *their Laws*, ſo as to be *judged* by them, without their leave, if they tranſgreſs; or to *pay* any tribute, *De Cleric. Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 28. They are all reſerved to the Power and Juriſdiction of the Pope. And he that ſhall conſider into what a vaſt and *boundleſs multitude* by reaſon of the ſeveral diſorderly orders of your *City Monks* and Friars, your Clergy is ſwelled into in moſt places of *Europe*, will eaſily perceive what your intereſt is in every Kingdom of it. I am perſwaded there is ſcarce a *Conſiderable Nation* wherein the Profeſſion of your Religion is enthroned, in which the Pope hath not an 100000. able fighting men, that are his peculiar ſubjects, exempted from the Power and juriſdiction of Kings themſelves; which you muſt needs conceive to be a bleſſed interpretation of that of the Apoſtle, *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher Powers*. And

7. You extend the *Papal Power to Things as well as Perſons* in the Dominions of all Kings and Commonwealths. For the *Lands* and Poſſeſſions that are

are given unto any of the Popes especial *Subjects*, you will have to be exempted from Tributes and publick burdens of the state. And you farther contend that it is not in the power of *any Kings or Rulers*, to hinder such alienations of Lands and Possessions from their Dominions. By this means no small part of the *Territories* of many Princes is subduced from under their power. The dreadful consequences of which *Principles* so startled the *wise state of Venice*, that you know they disputed it to the utmost with your *Vice-god Paul* the V. In dealing with them, as I remember, their attempt was successless: for notwithstanding the defence made of the *Papal process* against them by *Baronius*, *Bellarmine* and others, yet the actings of that *sober state* in forbidding such alienation of *Lands* and *Fees* from their Rule and power without their consent, with their plea for the subjection *of Ecclesiasticks* unto them in their own Dominions, was so vindicated by Doctor *Paul Suave*, *Marsilius of Padua*, and others, that the *horns* of the *Bull* which had been thrust forth against them into so great a length, were pulled in again.

I told you in the entrance of this Discourse, how unwilling I should have been to have given you the least *disquietment* in your way, had you only *attempted* to set off your own respects unto *Royal Power* unto the best advantage you could; but your setting up your Principles and Practices in *competition* with those of Protestants of any sort whatever, and *preferring* them before and above them as unto your deference unto Kings, and that in *matters Ecclesiastical*, hath made these few instances expressive of the *real sense* of your Church in this matter, as I suppose necessary and equal.

CHAP.

CHAP. 17.

Scripture. Story of the Progreſs and declenſion of Religion vindicated. Papal Artifices for the promotion of their Power and Intereſt. Advantages made by them on the Weſtern Empire.

YOu proceed *pag.* 70. unto the *Animadverſions* on your 13. Paragraph, entituled *Scripture*, wherein how greatly and cauſeleſly it is by you undervalued, is *fully* declared. But whatever is offered in it for the diſcovery of your *miſcarriage* and your own conviction, you *wiſely paſs over* without taking notice of it at all; and only repeat again *your Caſe* to the ſame purpoſe, and almoſt in the *very ſame words* you had done before. Now this I have already *conſidered* and removed out of our way, ſo that it is altogether needleſs to divert again to the diſcuſſion of it. That which we have to do, for the anſwering of all your *Cavils* and objections in and about the caſe you frame and propoſe, is, to declare and manifeſt the Scriptures *ſufficiency* for the Revelation of all neceſſary Truths therein affording us a *ſtable Rule* of faith every way ſuited to the deciſion of all differences in and about Religion, and to keep *Chriſtians* in perfect peace, as it did of old; And this we have already done. Why this *proper work* of the Scripture is not in all places and at all times effected, proceeds from the *Luſts* and prejudices of men, which when by the Grace of God they ſhall be removed, it will no longer be obſtructed.

Your next attempt *p.* 72. is upon my *ſtory of the progreſs and Corruption of Chriſtian Religion in the World*, with reſpect unto that of your own. Yours, you tell

us,

us, *is serious, temperate, and sober*; every way as excellent as *Suffenus* thought his *verses*. Mine, you say, *is wrought with defamation and wrath against all Ages and People*; very good. I doubt not but you thought it was fit you should say so, though you knew no reason *why*, nor could fix on any thing in it for your warrant in these intemperate reproaches. Do I say any thing but what the *stories* of all Ages, and the *Experience* of Christendome do proclaim? Is it now a *defamation* to report what the *learned* men of those dayes have recorded, what *good* men bewayled, and the sad effects whereof the world long groaned under, and was at length ruined by? What *wrath* is in all this? may not men be warned to take heed of *falling* into the like evils by the miscarriages of them that went before them without *wrath and defamation*? Are the books of the *Kings*, *Chronicles*, and *Prophets* fraught with *wrath and defamation* because they report, complain of, and reprove the sad *Apostasies* of the Church in those dayes, with the wickedness of the *Kings*, *Priests* and People that it was composed of, and declare the abomination of those wayes of false worship, licentiousness of life, violence and oppression, whereby they provoked God against them to their ruine? If *my story* be not true, why do you not disprove it? if it be, why do you exclaim against it? Do I not direct you unto *Authors* of unquestionable credit complaining of the things which I report from them? And if you know not that *many others* may be added unto these by me named, testifying the same things, you know very little of the matter you undertake to treat about. But we need go no further then *your self* to discover how *devoid* of all pretence your reproaches are, and that by considering the *exceptions*

ons which you put in to my *ſtory*, which may rationally be ſuppoſed to be the moſt *plauſible* you could invent, and directed againſt thoſe parts of it which you imagined were moſt obnoxious to your charge. I ſhall therefore conſider them in the order wherein they are propoſed, and diſcover whether the *keeneſs* of your aſſault anſwer the *noiſe* of your *out-cry* at its entrance.

Firſt, You obſerve, that I ſay, Joſeph *of* Arimathea *was in* England, *but that he taught the ſame religion that is now in* England. Unto which you reply; *But what is that Religion?* and this enquiry I have obſerved you elſewhere to inſiſt upon. But I told you before, that I intend the *Proteſtant Religion* and that as confirmed and eſtabliſhed by *Law* in this Kingdom; and the advantage you endeavour from *ſome differences* that are amongſt us, is little to your purpoſes, and leſs to the commendation of your ingenuity. For beſides that there are *differences* of as high a nature, and conſidering the Principles you proceed upon of *greater importance* among your ſelves, and thoſe agitated with as great *animoſities* and ſubtilties, as thoſe amongſt any ſort of men at variance about Religion in the world, you that ſo earneſtly ſeek and preſs after *a forbearance* for your profeſſion beſides and againſt the eſtabliſhed law, ſhould not, me thinks, at the ſame time, be ſo *forward* in reproaching us, that there are diſſenters in the *Kingdom* from ſome things eſtabliſhed by Law, eſpecially conſidering how *utterly inconſiderable* for the moſt part they are, in compariſon of the things wherein you differ from us all. This I fear, is the *reward* that they have cauſe to expect from many of you, who are inclined to *deſire* that you amongſt others might be partakers of *indulgence* from the extremity

extremity of the Law, though from others of you for whose ſakes they are enclined unto thoſe deſires, I hope they may look for better things, and ſuch as accompany charity, moderation, and peace, ſo that your firſt *exception* gives a greater impeachment unto your *own Candor* and ingenuity then unto the *Truth or Sobriety* of my ſtory.

You proceed and ſay, that *I tell you that the ſtory of* Fugatius *and* Damianus *Miſſioners of Pope* Eleutherius, *is ſuſpected by me for many reaſons*, and reply, *becauſe you aſſign none, I am therefore moved to think they may be all reduced unto one, which is that you will not acknowledge any good thing ever to have come from* Rome. But ſee what it is for a man to give himſelf up unto vain ſurmizes. You know full well, that I plead, that you are no *way concerned* in what was done at *Rome* in the dayes of *Eleutherius*, who was neither *Pope* nor *Papiſt*, nor knew any thing of that which we reject as *Popery*, ſo that I had no reaſon to diſclaim or deny any good thing that was then done at *Rome*, or by any from thence. Beſides, I can aſſure you, that *to this day* I would willingly own, embrace, and rejoyce in any *good* that is, or may be done there; may I be truly and *impartially* informed of it; and ſhould be glad to hear of more then unprejudiced men have been able of late Ages to inform us of. I am far from making an *encloſure* of all goodneſs unto any *party* of men in the world, and far from judging or condemning all, of any party, or ſuppoſing that no *good thing* can be done by them or proceed from them. Such conceits are apt to *flow* from the high towring thoughts of *Infallibility* and *ſupremacy*, and the confining of Chriſtianity to ſome certain company of men, in ſome parts of the world, which I am a ſtranger unto. I know no

party

party among Chriſtians that is in all things to be *admired*, nor any that is in all things to be *condemned*; and can perfectly free you, if you are capable of ſatisfaction, from all fears of my diſlike of any thing, becauſe it came, or comes from *Rome*. For to me it is all one, from whence *Truth* and *Virtue* come. They ſhall be welcome for their own ſakes. But you ſeem to be guided in theſe and the like *ſurmizes* by your own *humour*, Principles and way of managing things in Religion; a *Lesbian Rule*, which will ſuffer you to depart from the Paths of Truth and Charity, no oftener then you have a mind ſo to do. To deliver you from your *miſtake* in this *particular*, I ſhall now give you *ſome* of thoſe reaſons, which beget in me a ſuſpicion concerning the Truth of that *ſtory* about *Fagatius and Damianus*, as it is commonly told, only intimating the heads of them with all poſſible brevity.

Firſt then I ſuppoſe the *whole ſtory* is built on the Authority of the Epiſtle of *Eleutherius* unto *Lucius*, which is yet extant: other foundations of it, that I know of, is neither pleaded nor pretended. Now there want not *Reaſons* to prove that *Epiſtle* as the moſt of thoſe fathered on the *old Biſhops of Rome*, to be ſuppoſititious. For 1. The Author of that Epiſtle condemneth the *Imperial Laws*, and rejecteth them as unmeet to be uſed in the *Civil Government* of this Nation, which *Eleutherius* neither ought to have done, nor could ſafely do. 2. It ſuppoſeth *Lucius* to have ſent unto *Eleutherius* to have the *Roman Law* ſent unto him, which had been long before exerciſed in this Nation, and was well known in the *whole Province*, as he witneſſeth of dayes before theſe;

Gallia causidicos docuit, facunda Brittannos.

2. The *first Reporters* of this Story agree not in the *time* wherein the matter mentioned in it, ſhould fall out. *Beda lib. 1. cap. 4.* aſſigns it unto the year 156. which was twenty two years before *Eleutherius* was Biſhop, as *Baronius* manifeſts. *Henricus de Erfordia* aſcribes it unto the nineteenth year of the reign of *Verus* the Emperour who reigned not ſo many years at all. *Ado* refers it unto the time of *Commodus* with ſome part of whoſe reign the Epiſcopacy of *Eleutherius* did indeed contemporate. 2. *Geoffrey of Monmouth* the chief promoter of this report, joyneth it with ſo many *lyes* and open *fictions*, as may well draw the Truth of the whole ſtory into Queſtion. So that divers would have us believe that ſome ſuch thing was done at one time or other, but *when* they cannot tell. 3. Both the *Epiſtle of Eleutherius*, and the reporters of it, do ſuppoſe that *Lucius* to whom he wrote, was an *Abſolute Monarch in England*, King over the whole Kingdom with Supreme Authority and Power, ruling his Subjects by the *Advice of his Nobles*, without being obnoxious unto or dependent in his Government on any others. But this Suppoſition is ſo *openly repugnant* to the whole ſtory of the State of things in the *Province of England* in thoſe dayes, ſo that it is beyond the wit of man to make any reconciliation between them: For beſides that *Cæſar* and *Tacitus* do both plainly affirm, that in the dayes of the *Romans* entrance upon this *Iſland*, there was no ſuch King or *Monarch* among the Brittans, but that they were all divided into ſeveral *Toparchies*, and thoſe at *mortal feuds* and variance among themſelves, which made for the *conqueſt of them all*, it was now become

become a *Praſidiary Province* of the *Roman Empire*, and had been ſo from the dayes of *Claudius*, as *Suetonius*, *Tacitus* and *Dio* inform us. Eſpecially was it reduced into, and ſettled in that form by *Pub. Oſtorius* in the dayes of *Nero*, upon the Conqueſt of *Boadicia Queen of the Iceni*, and fully ſubjected in its remainders unto the Roman Yoak and Laws, after ſome ſtruglings for liberty, by *Julius Agricola* in the dayes of *Veſpatian*, as *Tacitus* aſſures us in the life of his Father in Law. In this Eſtate *Brittan* continued under *Nerva* and *Trajan*, the whole Province being afterwards ſecured by *Hadrian* from the incurſion of the *Picts* and other barbarous Nations, with the defence of his *famous walls*, whereof *Spartianus* gives us an account. In this condition did the whole *Province* continue unto the death of *Commodus*, under the rule of *Ulpius Marcellus* as we are informed by *Dio* and *Lampridius*. This was the ſtate of affairs in *Britain*, when the Epiſtle of *Elentherius* is ſuppoſed to be written. And for my part I cannot diſcover where this *Lucius* ſhould reign with all that Soveraignty aſcribed unto him. *Baronius* thinks he might do ſo beyond the *Picts* wall, which utterly overthrows the wholy ſtory, and leaves the *whole Province of Brittan*, utterly unconcerned in the coming of *Fugatius and Damianus* into this Iſland. Theſe are ſome, and many other reaſons of my ſuſpition I could add, manifeſting it to be far *more juſt* then yours that I had no reaſon for it, but only *becauſe I would not acknowledge that any good could come from Rome*.

Let us now ſee what you further *except* againſt the account I gave of the *progreſs* and *declenſion* of Religion in theſe, and other Nations. You add, *then ſay you, ſucceeded times of Luxury, Sloth, Pride,*

ambition, ſcandalous riots, and corruption both of faith and manners over all the Chriſtian world, both Princes, Prieſts, Prelates and people. But you ſomewhat pervert my words, ſo to make them *lyable* unto your exception: for as by me they are layed down, it ſeems you could find no occaſion againſt them. I tell you p. 253. *that after theſe things a ſad decay in faith and holineſs of life befell profeſſors, not only in this Nation, but for the moſt part all the world over; the ſtories of thoſe dayes are full of nothing more then the Oppreſſion, Luxury, Sloth of Rulers, the pride, ambition and unſeemly ſcandalous conteſts for prehminence of Sees, and extent of Juriſdiction among Biſhops, the ſenſuality and ignorance of the moſt of men.* Now whether theſe words are not agreeable to Truth and Sobriety, I leave to every man to judge, who hath any tolerable *acquaintance* with *Hiſtory*, or the occurrences of the Ages reſpected in them. Your reply unto them is, *not a grain of virtue or Goodneſs we muſt think in ſo many Chriſtian Kingdoms and Ages*: But why muſt you think ſo? who induceth you thereunto? when the *Church of Iſrael* was profeſſedly far more corrupted, then I have intimated the ſtate of the Chriſtian Church in any part of the world to have been, yet there was more then *a grain* of *virtue or goodneſs*, not only in *Elijah*, but in the meaneſt of *thoſe ſeven thouſand* who within the *ſmall precincts of that Kingdom* had not bowed the knee to *Baal*: I never in the leaſt queſtioned, but that in that *declenſion of Chriſtianity* which I intimated, and remiſſion of the moſt from their priſtine Zeal, but that there were *thouſands* and *ten thouſands* that kept their integrity and mourned for all the *Abominations* that they ſaw practiced in the world. Pray reflect a little upon the

the condition of the *Asian* Churches mentioned in the Revelation. The discovery made of their *Spiritual State* by Christ himself *chap.* 2. 3. was within less then *forty years* after their first planting, and yet you see most of them had *left their first love*, and were *decayed in their faith and Zeal.* In one of them there were *but a few names remaining* that had any life and integrity for Christ; the body of the Church having only *a name to live*, being truly and really dead, as to any acts of Spiritual life, wherein our Communion with God consists. And do you make it so strange, that whereas the Churches that were *planted* and watered by the *Apostles* themselves and enriched with many excellent Gifts and Graces, should within the space of less then *forty years*, by the Testimony of the Lord Christ himself, so *decay* and fall off from their first purity, faith and works, that other Churches who had not their advantages, should do so within the space of *four hundred years*, of which season I speak? I fear your vain conceit of *being rich and wanting nothing*, of *Infallibility* and impossibility to stand in need of any Reformation, of being as good as ever any Church was, or as you need to be, is that which hath more prejudiced your Church in particular then you can readily imagine. And what I affirmed of those other Churches, I know well enough how to prove out of the *best* and most approved Authors of those dayes. If besides *Historians* which give sufficient Testimony unto my observation, you will please to consult *Chrysostome Hom.* 3. *de Incomprehens. Dei natur. Hom.* 19. *in Ac.* 9. *Hom.* 15. *in Heb.* 8. and *Augustin. lib. de Fid. & bon. op. cap.* 19. you will find that I had good ground for what I said. And what if I had minded you of the words of *Salvian*

de provid. lib. 3. *Quemcunq; invenies in Eccleſia non aut ebrioſum, aut adulterum, aut fornicatorem, aut raptorem, aut ganeonem, aut latronem, aut homicidam, & quod omnibus potius eſt, prope hæc cuncta ſine fine?* Should I have eſcaped your cenſure of giving you *a ſtory falſe and defamatory, loaden with foul language againſt all Nations, ages and conditions, that none can like who bear any reſpect either to modeſty, Religion or Truth: ne ſævi magne Sacerdos.* What ground have you for this intemperate railing? What inſtance can you give of any thing of this nature? What expreſſion giving countenance unto this ſeverity? If you will exerciſe your ſelf in writing *Fiats*, you muſt of neceſſity arm your ſelf with a *little patience* to hear ſometimes things that do not pleaſe you, and not preſently cry out, *defamations, falſe, wrath, foul language, &c.* I ſuppoſe you know that not long after the times wherein I ſay Religion as to the *power* and purity of it much decayed in the world, that God brought an *overflowing ſcourge* and deluge of Judgements upon moſt of the Nations of *Europe*, that made Profeſſion of Chriſtianity. What in ſadneſs do you think might be the *cauſe* of that diſpenſation of his Providence? Do you think that all things were well enough amongſt them, and that in all things their wayes pleaſed God? is ſuch an apprehenſion ſuitable to the *Goodneſs*, Mercy, Love and faithfulneſs of God? or muſt he loſe the glory of all his properties in the adminiſtration of his righteous Judgements, rather then you will acknowledge a *demerit* in them whom he took away as with a Flood? So indeed the *Jews* would have had it of old under their ſufferings; but he pleaded and vindicated the *equality* and righteouſneſs of his wayes againſt their proud repinings.

Pray

Pray be as angry with me as you pleaſe, but take heed of *juſtifying* any againſt God: The task will prove too hard for you. And yet to this purpoſe are your following contemptuous expreſſions; For unto my *obſervation*, that after theſe times, the *Goths* and *Vandals* with others, overflowed the Chriſtian world, you ſubjoyn, *either to puniſh them we may believe, or to teach them how to mend their manners*. Sir, I know not what you believe, or do not believe, or whither you *believe any thing of this kind or no*. But I will tell you what I am perſwaded all the world believes, who know the *ſtory* of thoſe times, and are not *Atheiſts*: and it is, that though the *Goths* and *Vandals*, *Saxons*, *Huns*, *Francks* and *Longobards*, with the reſt of the barbarous Nations, who divided the *Provinces of the Weſtern Empire* amongſt them, had it may be no more thoughts to *puniſh the Nations profeſſing Chriſtianity*, for their ſins, wickedneſs and ſuperſtition, (though one of their Chief Leaders proclaimed himſelf the *Scourge of God* againſt them) then had the *King of Babylon* to puniſh *Judah* for her ſins, and Idolatry in eſpecial, yet that *God ordered them*, no leſs then he did *him* in his Providence for thoſe ends which you ſo *ſcorn* and deſpiſe, that is, either to *puniſh them* for their ſins, or to provoke them to leave them by *repentance*. Take heed of being a *ſcoffer* in theſe things, leaſt your bands be made ſtrong. God is not unrighteous who *exerciſeth judgement*. The Judge of all the world will do right. Nor doth he afflict any people, much leſs extirpate them from the face of the earth without a Cauſe. Many wicked, provoking, *ſinful Idolatrous Nations*, he ſpareth in his patience and forbearance, and will yet do ſo; but he deſtroyes *none* without a Cauſe. And all that I intended by the

remembrance of the *ſins* of thoſe Nations, which were expoſed unto devaſtation, was but to ſhew that their *deſtruction was of themſelves.*

You leap unto another clauſe which you rend out of my diſcourſe, that *theſe Pagans took at laſt unto Chriſtianity*, and ſay, *happily becauſe it was a more looſe and wicked life then their own Pagan Profeſſion.* But are you not aſhamed of this *triſling?* doth this diſprove my Aſſertion? Is it not true? Did they not do ſo? Did not the above mentioned Nations when they had ſettled themſelves in the *Provinces* of the Empire, take upon them the Profeſſion of the *Chriſtian* Religion? Did not the *Saxons* do ſo in *Brittany*, the *Francks* in *Gaule*, the *Goths* and *Longobards* in *Italy*, the *Vandals* in *Africk*, the *Huns* in *Pannonia?* I cannot believe you are ſo ignorant in theſe things, as your exceptions beſpeak you. Nor do I well underſtand what you intend by them, they are ſo *frivolous* and uſeleſs, nor ſurely can any man in his right wits ſuppoſe them of any validity to impeach the evidence of the known ſtories, which my diſcourſe relates unto.

But you lay more weight on what you cull out in the next place, which as you have layed it down is, *That theſe now Chriſtened Pagans advanced the Popes authority, when Chriſtian Religion was now grown degenerate*, and ſay, *now we come to know how the Roman Biſhop became a Patriarch above the reſt, by means namely of the new converted Pagans.* But I wonder you ſpeak ſo *nicely* in their chief affair. As though that were the Queſtion whether the *Biſhop of Rome* according unto ſome Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions were made a *Patriarch* or no, and that whither he were not eſteemed to have ſome *kind of prehewinence* in reſpect of thoſe other Biſhops, who upon

the

the ſame account were ſo ſtiled. When we have occaſion to ſpeak of this *Queſtion* we ſhall not be backward to declare our thoughts in it. For the preſent you repreſent the Pope unto us as the *abſolute Head of the Church Catholick*, the ſupream Judge of all controverſies in Religion, the *ſole fountain* of Unity, and ſpring of all Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, *&c.* Nor did I ſay that your Pope was by theſe *Nations* after their converſion *advanced unto the height you labour* now to fix him in, but only that his Authority was *ſignally advanced* by them, which is ſo certain a Truth that your own *Hiſtorians* and *Annaliſts* openly proclaim it, and you cannot deny it unleſs you would be eſteemed the moſt *ungrateful* Perſon in the world. But this is your way and manner; all that is done for you is *meer duty*, which when it is done you will thank no man for. Are all the Grants of Power, Priviledges and Poſſeſſions made unto your *Papal See*, by the *Kings* of this Nation both *before* and *ſince* the Conqueſt, by the Kings of *France*, and Emperours of the Poſterity of *Charles* the *Great*, by the *Kings* of *Poland*, *Denmark* and *Sweden*, by the *Longobards* in *Italy* not worth your thanks? It is well you have got your ends; the *net* may be caſt away when the *fiſh* is caught.

But an odd chance, you ſay, it was that they ſhould think of advancing him to what they never heard either himſelf or any other advanced unto before among Chriſtians: but yet this was done, and no ſuch *odd chance* neither. Your *Popes* had for a ſeaſon before been aſpiring to *greater heights* then formerly they had attained unto, and uſed all wayes *poſſible* to commend themſelves and their Authority, not what *truly* it was, but what they would have it ſo be, unto all with whom they had to do; and there-

upon by ſundry means and artifices impoſed upon the *nations* ſome undue conceits of it, though it was not *fully* nor ſo eaſily admitted of, as it may be you may imagine. But in many things they were *willing* to gratifie him in his pretenſions, little knowing the tendency of them; many things he took the advantage of their *ſtreights* and diviſions to impoſe upon them; many things he obtained from them by *flattery* and carnal compliances, untill by ſundry *ſerpentine* advances he had brought them all unto his *bow*, and ſome of the greateſt of them to his *ſtirrup*.

It was yet more odd, ſay you, *and ſtrange that all Chriſtendome ſhould calmly ſubmit unto a power ſet up anew by young converted Pagans: no Prince or Biſhop either here or of any either Chriſtian Kingdom either then or ever after to this day excepting againſt it. Had not all the Biſhops and Prieſts of* Africa, Egypt, Syria, Thrace, Greece *and all the Chriſtian world acknowledged by an hundred experiments the ſupream Spiritual Authority of the Roman Patriarch in all times before this deluge of Goths and Vandals? But why do I expoſtulate with you, who write theſe things not to judicious Readers, but to fools and children, who are not more apt to tell a truth, then to believe a lye.* But Sir, you ſhall quickly ſee whoſe diſcourſe, yours or mine, ſtand in need of *weak* and *credulous* Reader. That which you have in this place to oppoſe is only this, *that your Papal Authority received a ſignal advancement, by and among the Northern Nations, who after long wars divided the Provinces of the Weſtern Empire among them.* Now this is ſo broad a Truth, that nothing but *brutiſh ignorance*, or obſtinate perverſneſs can poſſibly cauſe any man to call it into Queſtion. It was not abſolutely the *ſetting up*

of

of the Papacy, but an acceſſion unto the *Papal power* and authority which I aſcribed unto that original. And this if you dare to deny, it were eaſie out of your own *Annaliſts* to overwhelm you with inſtances in the confirmation of it. But yet neither were your *Conceſſions* made, nor his aſſumptions carried on in *that ſilence* which you fancy, when you imagine, that his *aſpirings* were neither *taken notice* of, *nor oppoſed*, but that all Chriſtendom ſhould calmly ſubmit unto them. Where do you think you are, that you talk at this rate? Did you never read of any oppoſition made in *former dayes* unto your pretended Papal Power? none at all? from *no Kings*, *no Princes*, *no Biſhops*, no parts of Chriſtendom? happy man, who hath lived ſo quietly as you ſeem to have done, and ſo little concerned in things paſt or preſent. Did you never read or hear of the *Declarations* and *Edicts* of Emperours and Kings, of *Determinations* of Councils, *Writings* of Learned men in all Ages againſt your *Papal* Uſurpations? Did you never hear how before the times that we now talk of, *Irenæus* reproved *Victor*, how *Cyprian* oppoſed *Cornelius* and *Stephen*, how the *Councils* of *Africk* admoniſhed *Celeſtine* and *Boniface* of their miſcarriages in their claims of *Power* and *Juriſdiction*? Are you an utter ſtranger unto the oppoſition made by the *German Emperours* unto your *Hildebrandine* Supremacy, with the books written againſt your pretenſions to that purpoſe? Have you not read your own *Baronius* a great part of whoſe *Voluminous Annals* conſiſts in his endeavours to vindicate your *Papal Power* from the open oppoſition that was made to its introduction in every Age? You muſt needs *ſleep quietly*, ſeeing you lye ſo far from noiſe. I have already in part let you ſee the *fondneſs* of this dream, that

that your Papal Supremacy was ever *calmly ſubmitted* unto, and have manifeſted that it was publickly condemned before it was born. But becauſe I then confined my ſelf unto more *antient times* then thoſe which are now under diſcourſe, I ſhall mind you of a *few inſtances* of the oppoſition made unto it, either *about* or preſently after that ſignal advancement, which I affirmed that it received from the newly converted Nations of the *Weſt*.

About the year 608. preſently after the *Saxons* had received Chriſtianity, and therewithall contributed their power, ſome of them at leaſt to the furtherance of your *Papal claim*, which was then ſet on foot, though in a much inferiour degree unto what you have ſince promoted it unto, it was publickly *excepted againſt* and diſclaimed by a *Convention* or Synod of the Britiſh Clergy, who denyed that they *owed any ſubjection* unto the *See* of *Rome*, or any reſpect, but *ſuch as Chriſtians ought to bear one towards another*, and would not give place unto its *Authority* in things of very ſmall weight and moment. *Bed. Hiſt. lib. 2. cap. 2. Concil. Anglic. p.* 188. The ſixth *general Council* that condemned *Pope Honorius* for an *Heretick*, *An.* 681. with the *Second Nicene*, *An.* 787. which confirmed the ſame ſentence, do *ſhrewdly impeach* your preſent ſupremacy. In the fourth Council of *Conſtantinople*, *An.* 870. the *Epanagnoſticum* of *Baſilius* the Emperour to the Synod approved by them all, begins thus: *Cum Divina & benigniſſima Providentia nobis gubernacula univerſalis navis commiſit, omne ſtudium arripuimus, & ante publicas curas, eccleſiaſticas contentiones diſſolvendi: whereas the gratious Divine Providence has committed unto us, the Government of the Univerſal ſhip, we have taken all occaſion before other*

other publick cares to diſſolve or compoſe Eccleſiaſtical Diſſenſions. How ſuitable theſe expreſſions of the *Emperour* are unto your preſent pretenſions, your ſelf may judge. And having mentioned that *Synod* which you call the eighth *general Council*, becauſe of its oppoſition to the *learned Photius*, I ſhall only ask of you, whither you think there was no exception made to your ſupremacy by that *Photius*, with the Emperours and Biſhops of the *Eaſt*, who conſulted with him, and afterwards juſtified him againſt the *Cenſures*, procured againſt him by Pope *Nicholas* and *Hadrian*? do not all your writers to this day complain of this oppoſition made unto you by *Photius*? What think you of the *Council of Frankford* aſſembled by *Charles the Great*, which ſo openly condemned that Doctrine which *Pope Hadrian* and the Roman Clergy with him laboured ſo earneſtly to promote, as we ſhall afterwards ſhew? In the ſame order you may place the Councils that depoſed *their Popes*, as did *one* at *Rome* under *Otho* the Emperour, *John* the 12. a ſweet Biſhop, *An.* 963. another at *Sutrinum An.* 1046. when *Cerberus* as *Baronius* himſelf confeſſeth, ruled at *Rome*, *An.* 1044. *n.* 5. *Three Popes at once* domineering there, *Uno contra duos*, ſaith Sigibert, *& duobus contra unum, de Papatu contendentibus, Rex contra eos vadit, eoſq; Canonica & Imperiali Cenſura deponit. One againſt two, and two againſt one contending about the Papacy, the King went againſt them all, and depoſed them by Canonical and Imperial Cenſure.* Or as *Platina Vit. Greg.* 6. *Henricus habita Synodo, tria iſta teterrima monſtra abdicare ſe magiſtratu coegit:* Henry *calling a Synod compelled thoſe three filthy monſters* (Benedict, Silveſter *and* Gregory) *to renounce their Magiſtracy or Papacy.* Have you not heard how many *Synods* and *Councils*

Councils were convened againſt the Uſurpations and Innovations of *Gregory* the ſeventh, as at *Worms*, *Papia*, *Brixia*, *Mentz*, and elſewhere? what think you of the Aſſembly at *Clarendon* here in *England*, *An.* 1164. where it was decreed ſaith *Matth. Paris*, *juxta antiquas Regni conſuitudines non licere vel Archiepiſcopis vel Epiſcopis vel aliis Perſonis exire Regnum abſq; licentia Regis*, that according to the *Antient Cuſtoms of the Kingdom it was not Lawful for any Archbiſhops, Biſhops or other perſons to depart the Kingdom without the leave of the King*; that is to go to *Rome*, and that in all Appeals, *ultimo perveniendum ad Regem ita ut non debeat ulterius procedi ſine aſſenſu Domini Regis*, the laſt is to be made unto the King, without whoſe aſſent no further proceſs ought to be made. For oppoſition unto which Decree *Thomas* of *Becket* had the hap to become a *Traytor* and a *Saint*. The ſtories of the *Patriarchs* of *Ravenna* in times more remote, and in thoſe of the *Council* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* in latter Ages are too well known to be particularly again inſiſted on. Were *Princes* more ſilent then Synods? Reconcile if you are able the *Laws of Charles* the Great and his *Son Lewis* with *their Popes* now claimed Authority. *Henry the ſecond* of *Germany* both *depoſed Popes* and limited their Power. *Henry* 3. attempted no leſs, though with leſs ſucceſs. *See Sigibert Chron. An.* 1046. *Platin. vita Gregor.* 6. *Sigon. de Reg. lib.*8. From that time forward untill the *Reformation* no one *age* can be inſtanced in, wherein great, open and ſignal oppoſition was not made unto the *Papal* Authority, which you ſeek again to introduce. The inſtances already given are ſufficient to convince the *vanity* of your pretence, that never any oppoſition was made unto it.

Of

Of the ſame nature is that which you nextly affirm, *of all the Biſhops and Prieſts of* Africa, Egypt, Syria, Thrace, Greece, *and all the Chriſtian World by an hundred experiments acknowledging the ſupream ſpiritual Authority of the Roman Patriarch.* I muſt I ſee ſtill mind you of what it is that you are to ſpeak unto. It is not the *Patriarchate of your Pope*, with the Authority, Priviledges and preheminences which by virtue thereof he layes claim unto, but his *ſingular ſucceſſion to Chriſt*, and *Peter*, in the *abſolute Headſhip of the whole Catholick Church*, that you are treating about. Now ſuppoſing you may be better skilled in the affairs of the *Eaſtern* Church then for ought as I can yet perceive you are in thoſe of the *Weſtern*, let me crave this favour of you, that you would direct me unto *one* of thoſe hundred experiments, whereby the acknowledgment you mention, preceding the Converſion of the *Nothern Nations*, may be confirmed. It will I confeſs unto you be a *ſingular kindneſs*, ſeeing I know not where to find any one of that nature within the time limited; nor to tell you the Truth, ſince unto this day. For I ſuppoſe you will not imagine that the faigned Profeſſions of *ſubjection*, which poverty and hopes of ſupplies from the Court of *Rome* hath extorted of late from ſome few mean perſons whoſe *Titles* only were of any Conſideration in the world, will deſerve any place in this diſquiſition. Untill you are pleaſed therefore to favour me with *your information*, I muſt abide in my ignorance of any ſuch experiments as thoſe which you intimate.

The *Artifices* I confeſs of your Popes in former dayes to draw men, eſpecially in the *Eaſtern Church* to an acknowledgement of that Authority, which in their ſeveral ſeaſons they claimed, have been many,

many, and their ſucceſs various. Sometimes they obtained a *ſeeming compliance* in ſome; and ſometimes they procured their Authors very *ſhrewd rebukes*. It may not be amiſs to recount ſome of them.

1. Upon all occaſions they ſet *forth themſelves*, the dignity and *preheminence of your See*, with ſwelling *Encomiums* and *Titles*, *aſſerting their own Primacy and Power*. Such ſelf aſſumings are many of the old *Papal* Epiſtles ſtuffed withall. A ſober humble Chriſtian cannot but *nauſeate* at the reading of them. For it is eaſily diſcernable how *Antievangelical* ſuch Courſes are, and how unbecoming all that pretend themſelves to be Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt; from theſe are their chiefeſt Teſtimonies in *this Caſe* taken; and we may ſay of them all, they *bear witneſs to themſelves*, and that contrary to the Scripture, and their witneſs is not true.

2. *When, and wherever ſuch Letters and Epiſtles as proclaimed their Priviledges have been admitted through the inadvertency of Modeſty of them to whom they were ſent, unwilling to quarrel with them about the good opinion which they had of themſelves* (which kind of entertainment they yet ſometimes met not withall) the next ſucceſſors allwayes *took for granted*, and pleaded what their predeceſſours had preſumptuouſly broached, as that which of right and unqueſtionably belonged unto them. And this they made ſure of, that they would never loſe any ground, or take any one *ſtep* backwards from what any of them had advanced unto.

3. Wherever they heard *of any difference* among Biſhops, they *were ſtill impoſing their Umpirage upon them*, which commonly by the one or other of the parties at variance, to *ballance* thereby ſome diſadvantages, that they had to wreſtle withall, was admitted;

mitted; yea ſometimes they would begin to *take* part with them that were openly in the wrong, even *Hereticks* themſelves, that they might thereby procure an addreſs to them from others, which afterwards they would interpret as an expreſs of their ſubjection. And wherever their *Umpirage* was admitted, they were never wanting to improve their own intereſt by it, like the old *Romans* who being choſen to determine a Controverſie between other *People* about ſome lands, adjudged them unto themſelves.

4. *If any Perſon that was really injured*, or pretended ſo to be, made any Addreſs unto them for any kind of *Relief*, immediately they laid hold of their *Addreſs* as an Appeal to their Authority, and acted in their behalf accordingly, though they were ſometimes *chidden* for their pains, and adviſed to meddle with what they had to do withall.

5. Did *any Biſhops of note* write them Letters of reſpect, preſently in *their reſcripts* they return them thanks for their *profeſſion of ſubjection to the See Apoſtolick*; ſo ſuppoſing them to do that, which in truth they did not, they promiſe to do for them that which they never deſired, and by both made way for the enlargment of the confines of their own authority.

6. *Where any Prince or Emperour* was entangled in his affairs, they were ſtill ready to cruſh them into that condition of trouble, from whence they could not be delivered but by their aſſiſtance; or to make them believe that their *adherence unto them*, was the only means to preſerve them from ruine, and ſo procured their *ſuffrage* unto their Authority.

Unto theſe and the like heads of Corrupt and ſinful *Artifices* may the moſt of the Teſtimonies commonly pleaded for the Popes Supremacy be referred.

By

By ſuch wayes and means hath it been erected. Yet far enough from any ſuch prevalency for *ſeven hundred years*, as to afford us any of the experiments which you boaſt of.

The next thing you except againſt in my *ſtory*, is, my affirming *that* Auſtin *the Monk who came hither from* Rome, *was a man as far as appears by ſtory the little acquainted with the Goſpel.* In the repetition of which words to keep your hand in ure, you leave out that expreſſion *as far as appears by the ſtory*, which is the evidence whereunto I appeal for the Truth of my Aſſertion, and add to aggravate the matter, the word *very*, *very little*, and then add, *here is the thanks that good St.* Auſtin *hath, who out of his love and kindneſs entred upon the wild forreſt of our Paganiſm, with great hazards and inexpreſſible ſufferings of hunger, cold, and other corporal inconveniencies!* But in the place you except againſt, I acknowledge that God made him a *ſpecial inſtrument* in bringing the Scripture or Goſpel amongſt us, which I preſume alſo he declared, according to the light and ability which he had. But you are your *own Mothers Son*; nothing will ſerve your turn, but *abſolute*, *moſt pure* and *perfect*. For what I have further intimated of him, there are ſundry things in the *Hiſtory* of his coming hither, and proceedings here that warrant the ſuggeſtion. The *Queſtions* that he ſent for Reſolution unto *Gregory* at *Rome*, diſcover what manner of man he was. Let a man be never ſo partially addicted unto him, and his work, he muſt acknowledge that their *frivolouſneſs* and impertinency, conſidering the work he had in hand, diſcover ſomewhat beſides learning and wiſdom in him. So alſo did his *driving* of 10000. *men*, beſides an innumerable company of *women and children*

dren altogether into the river *Swale* in *Yorkſhire*, and there cauſing them to baptize one another: His Conteſt with the *Britiſh Biſhops* about the time of the obſervation *of Eaſter*, breaking the peace for a *Circumſtance of a Ceremony* that hath coſt the Church twenty times more trouble then it is worth, is of the ſame nature. And I deſire to know whence you have your *ſtory of his inexpreſſible ſuffering* here amongſt us. All that I can find, informs us that he was *right meetly entertained* by King *Ethelbert*, at his firſt Landing by the means of *Berda* his wife a *Chriſtian* before his coming, with all plentifull proviſion for himſelf and his companions. The next news we hear of him, is about his Archiepiſcopacy, his *Pall*, and his Throne, from whence he would not *riſe* to receive the *poor Brittans* that came to confer with him. Further of his ſufferings as yet I can meet with nothing.

And theſe are the things which you thought your ſelf *able* to except againſt in *my ſtory* of the Progreſs and Declenſion of Religion. The ſumm of it I ſhall now comprize in ſome few Aſſertions, which you may do well to conſider, and get them diſproved.

1. The Firſt is, *That the Goſpel was preached in this Iſland in the dayes of the Apoſtles*, by perſons coming from the *Eaſt*, directed by the Providence of God for that purpoſe; moſt probably by *Joſeph of Arimathea* in chief, without any reſpect to *Rome*, or miſſion from thence.

2. That the Doctrine preached then by them, was the *ſame* that is now publickly profeſſed in *England*; and not that *taught* by the *Church of Rome*, where there is a diſcrepancy between us.

3. That the ſtory of the coming of *Fugatius* and *Damianus* into the *Province of Brittain*, ſent by

Elentherius unto *Lucius*, is uncertain, improbable, and not to be reconciled unto the ſtate and condition of the *Affairs* in theſe Nations, at the time ſuppoſed for its accompliſhment.

4. That about the fourth, fifth and ſixth Centuries, the *Generality of the Profeſſors* of Chriſtian Religion in the world, were wofully declined from the *primitive zeal*, piety, faith, love and purity in the worſhip of God, which their Predeceſſors in the ſame *Profeſſion* glorified God by; and that in particular the *Britiſh Church* was much degenerated.

5. That *the Biſhops of* Rome *for five hundred years never laid claim* unto that Soveraign Power and Infallibility which they have challenged ſince the dayes of *Pope Gregory* the ſeventh.

6. That the *Biſhops of Rome* in that ſpace of time, pretending unto ſome *diſorderly Supremacy* over other Biſhops and Churches, though incomparably ſhort of their after and preſent pretences, were *rebuked* and oppoſed by the beſt and moſt learned men of thoſe dayes.

7. That the diſtraction of the Provinces of the *Weſtern* part of the *Empire* by *Goths*, *Vandals*, *Hunns*, *Saxons*, *Alans*, *Franks*, *Longobards*, and their aſſociates, was no leſs juſt in the holy Providence of God upon the account of the *moral evils* and Superſtitions of the Profeſſors of Chriſtianity amongſt them, then was that which afterwards enſued of the *Eaſtern Provinces* by the *Saracens* and *Turks*.

8. That theſe Nations having planted themſelves in the *Provinces of the Empire*, together with Chriſtianity either *received* anew, or *retained* many Paganiſh Cuſtoms, Ceremonies, Rites and Opinions therewithal.

9. That their Kings, by *Grants* of *Priviledges*, *Donations*,

nations and *Conceſſions* of Power, made partly out of blind zeal, partly to ſecure ſome intereſts of their own, exceedingly advanced the Papal Power, and confirmed their formerly rejected pretenſions.

10. That when they began to perceive and feel the *pernicious effects* and conſequences of their own facility, their grants being made a ground of farther incroachments, they oppoſed themſelves in their Laws and Edicts and Practices againſt them.

11. That there was on all hands a *ſad declenſion* in the Weſtern Church, In Doctrine, Worſhip and Manners continually progreſſive unto the time of Reformation.

Theſe are the principal Aſſertions on which my *ſtory* is built, and which it ſuppoſeth. If you have a mind to get them, or any of them *called* to an account and examined, I ſhall if God will, and I live, give them their confirmation from ſuch *undoubted records* as you have no juſt cauſe to except againſt.

CHAP. 18.

Reformation of Religion. Papal contradictions. Ejice ancillam.

SOme of your following leaves are ſuch as admit of no uſeful conſideration. *Wilful miſtakes*, *diverſions* from the Cauſe under debate, with *vain flouriſhes* make up both pages in them. I ſhall paſs through them briefly, and give you ſome account from them of your ſelf, and your *prevarication* in the Cauſe whoſe defence you have undertaken. Pag. 75. you undertake the thirteenth chapter of

the *Animadverſions*, which diſcuſſeth the Story of the Reformation of Religion, which you took up on common fame.

Fama malum quo non aliud velocius ullum.

And that you may be able to ſay *ſomewhat* to the diſcourſe before you, or to make a *pretence* of doing ſo, you wholly paſs by *every thing* that is contained in it, and impoſe upon me that which is not in it at all, which you ſtrenuouſly exagitate. For whereas a little to take off your *edge* in reflecting on the *Perſons* whom you ſuppoſed inſtrumental in the Reformation, eſpecially King *Henry* the eighth, I minded you how eaſie a thing it was to deprive you of your *pretended Advantage*, by giving you an account of the *wicked lives*, with the brutiſh and Diaboliſ practices of many *of your Popes* whom you account the *Heads of your Church*, and the very Center wherein all the lines of your Profeſſion meet, you feign as though I had *impoſed* all the crimes I intimated them to be guilty of, and many more whoſe names you heap together, *upon Popery*, or the Religion that you profeſs; yea that I ſhould ſay that it is nothing elſe but only an heap of the *wickedneſſes by you enumerated.* Now this I did not do, but you feign it of your own heads, that you may have ſomewhat to ſpeak againſt, and a pretence of intimating in the cloſe of your diſcourſe, that *you have conſidered the Chapter about Reformation*, whereas in truth you have not ſpoken one word unto it, nor unto any thing contained in it. And yet when you have done, as if you had been talking about any thing wherein I am in the leaſt meaſure concerned, you come in, in the cloſe with your grave advice, *That I ſhould take heed of blaſpheming that*

innocent

innocent Catholick flock, which the Angels of God watch over to protect them. As though a man could not remember the *wicked crimes* of your *nocent Popes*, but he muſt be thought to blaſpheme the *innocent flock* of Chriſt, which never had greater enemies in this world, then ſome of them have been. If this be to blaſpheme, then ſome of your *own Councils, all your* Hiſtorians, many of the moſt *learned* men of your Church are notorious blaſphemers. But you wilfully miſtake, and begg that their *Schiſmatical Papal faction* may be eſteemed the *innocent Catholick Church* of Chriſt, without a Conceſſion whereof, your inferences and perſwaſions are very weak and feeble.

Of the like nature unto this, is your enſuing diſcourſe about the *Contradictions* which you fancied in your *Fiat Lux* to be *impoſed on Papiſts, pag.* 77. Two things you inſiſt upon, waving thoſe that you had formerly mentioned, as finding them in their examination unable to yield you the advantage you thought to make of them; you feign a *new contradiction*, which you ſay is impoſed on Papiſts. *For* ſay you, *while our Kings reign in peace, then the Papiſt Religion is perſecuted as contrary to Monarchy; when we have deſtroyed that Government, then is the Papiſt harraſſed, ſpoyled, pillaged, murdered, becauſe their Religion is wholly addicted unto Monarchy, and Papiſts are all for Kings; Theſe are Contradictions; is there not ſomewhat of the power of darkneſs in this?* But you again miſtake, and that I fear becauſe you will do ſo; There was no Perſecution of *Papiſts* in this Land at any time, but what was in *perſuit* of ſome Laws that were made againſt them. Now not *one* of thoſe Laws intimate any ſuch thing, as that they were *oppoſite unto Monarchy*, but rather their

deſign to promote a *double Monarchy* on different accounts in this Nation, the one of *the Pope*, and the other of *him* to whom the Kingdom was given by the Pope, and who for many years in vain attempted to *poſſeſs* himſelf of it. And on that account were you charged with an oppoſition to *our Monarchs*, but not unto *Monarchy* it ſelf. And yet I muſt ſay, that if what hath been before diſcourſed of your faith and perſwaſion concerning the *Papal Soveraignty* be well conſidered, it will be found that if not *your Religion*, yet the *Principles* of ſome of the chief Profeſſors of it, do carry in their womb a great impeachment of *Imperial Power*. Nor can I gather, that in the times of *our Confuſion* you ſuffered as *Papiſts* for your friendſhip and love to *Monarchy*, whatever ſome individual Perſons amongſt you might do: Seeing ſome of you would have been contented with its *everlaſting Seclusion*, ſo that your intereſt in the *land* might have been ſecured. And whether your *Popes* themſelves be not of that mind, I leave to all men to judge, who know how much they are wont to preferr their *own intereſt* before the *rights* of other men. In the mean time you may take notice, that whileſt men are owned to perſue *one certain End*, they may at ſeveral times fix on *mediums* for the compaſſing of it, oppoſite and contrary one to another. *Hæc non ſucceſſit, alia aggrediamur via*; when one way fails, another quite contrary unto it may be fixed on. And whileſt it is ſuppoſed that their end is the *promotion of the Papal Intereſt*, it is not improbable but that at ſeveral times you may make uſe of ſeveral wayes and means oppoſite and contrary one to another; and that this may be imputed unto you, without the charge of *Contradictions* upon you. But you may

if

if you pleaſe omit diſcourſes of this nature. I am none of thoſe that would charge any thing upon you to your diſadvantage in this world. Neither do I deſire your trouble any more then mine own. My aim is only to defend the Truth which you oppoſe.

Your next attempt is to vindicate your ſelf from any ſuch intention in your application of *ejice ancillam cum puero ſuo*, *as I apprehended*. Whither what you ſay to this purpoſe will ſatisfie your *Reader* or no, I greatly queſtion. For my part, as I ſhall ſpeak nothing but what *I believe* to be according unto truth, ſo if I am, or have been at any time *miſtaken* in my apprehenſion of your ſenſe and mind, I am reſolved not to defend any thing becauſe I *have ſpoken it*. *Homo ſum*, and therefore ſubject to miſtakes; though I am not in the leaſt convinced that I was *actually miſtaken* in my conceptions of your ſenſe and meaning in your *Fiat*. But that we may not needleſly contend about *words*, yours or mine, I ſhall put you into a way whereby you may *immediately* determine this difference, and manifeſt that I miſtook your intention, if I did ſo indeed. And it is this, Do but renounce thoſe *Principles*, which if you maintain, you conſtantly *affirm* all that in thoſe words I ſuppoſed you to *intimate*, and this ſtrife will be at an end. And they are but theſe two; 1. That all thoſe who *refuſe* to believe and worſhip God according to the Propoſitions and Determinations of your Church, are *Hereticks*. 2. That *obſtinate Hereticks* are to be accurſed, perſecuted, deſtroyed and conſumed out of the world. Do but renounce *theſe Principles*, and I ſhall readily acknowledge my ſelf miſtaken in the intention of the words you mention. If you will not ſo do, to

what purpoſe is it to contend with you about *one ſingle expreſſion*, ambiguouſly as you pretend uſed by you, when in your *avowed Principles* you maintain whatever is ſuggeſted to be intimated in it! Thus eaſily might you have ſaved your *longſome* diſcourſe in this matter. And as for the *embleme* which you cloſe it with, of the *Rod of Moſes*, which as you ſay, *taken in the right end was a walking ſtaff, in the wrong a Serpent*, it is ſuch a childiſh figment, as you have no cauſe to thank them that impoſed it upon your credulity.

CHAP. 19.

Of preaching the Maſs: And the Sacrifice of it. Tranſubſtantiation. Service of the Church.

WE are arrived at length unto the Conſideration of thoſe *particulars* in your *Roman faith*, which in your *Fiat* you choſe out either to adorn and ſet off the way in Religion which you invite your *Countreymen* to embrace, or ſo to *gild* it, as that they may not take any prejudice from them againſt the *whole* of what you profeſs. The firſt of theſe is that which you entituled *Meſſach*, which you now inform us to be a *Saxon* word, the ſame with *Maſs*. But why you make uſe of ſuch an *abſolete word* to amuze your Readers withal, you give us no account. Will you give me leave to *gueſs*? for if I miſtake not, I am not far from your fancy. *Plain downright Maſs* is a thing that hath gotten a very ill name amongſt your *Countreymen*, eſpecially ſince ſo many of their forefathers were *burned to death* for refuſing to reſort unto it. Hence it may

may be you thought meet to wave that name, which both the *thing known to be ſignified by it* in its own nature, and your *procedure* about it had rendred obnoxious to ſuſpicion. So you call it by a *new old name*, or an *old new name*, that men might not at firſt know what you intended upon your invitation to entertain them withal: and yet it may be, that they would like it under a *new dreſs*, which the *old name* might have ſtartled them from the Conſideration of. But *Maſs* or *Meſſach* let it be as you pleaſe, we ſhall now conſider what it is, that you offer afreſh concerning it, and hear you ſpeak out your own words. Thus you ſay, *p.* 81.

Having laughed at my admiration of Catholick Service, you carp at me for ſaying that the Chriſtians were never called together to hear a Sermon; to convince me you bring ſome places out of St. Pauls *Epiſtles, and the Acts which commend the Miniſtry of the Word. This indeed is your uſual way of refuting my Speeches. You flouriſh copiouſly in that which is not at all againſt me, and never apply it to my words, leaſt it ſhould appear as it is, impertinent. I deny not that Converts were further inſtructed, or that the preaching of Gods Word is good and uſefull; but that which I ſay, is, that Primitive Chriſtians were never called together for that end, as the great work of their Chriſtianity. This I have clearly proved.*

Well Sir, without retorſion, which *juſt indignation* againſt this unhandſome management of a deſperate Cauſe is ready to ſuggeſt, be pleaſed to take a *little view* of your own words once more, *pag.* 279. you tell us, that *the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical Chriſtians placed their Religion not in hearing, or making Sermons, FOR THEY HAD NONE, but in attending to their Chriſtian Lyturgie; and the Ser-*

mons

mons mentioned in the Acts, *were made to the Jews and Pagans for their Converſion, not to any Chriſtians at all.* Could I now take any other courſe to confute theſe *falſe and impious Aſſertions*, then what I did in the Animadverſions? I proved unto you, that *Sermons* were made unto Chriſtians by the Apoſtles for their edification; that *order* is given by them for the *inſtant preaching of the Word*, *in* and unto the *Churches* unto the end of the world; and that thoſe are by them ſignally commended who *laboured* in that work; and what can be ſpoken more directly to the confutation of your Aſſertion? You would now ſhrowd your ſelf under the ambiguity of that expreſſion, *the great work of their Chriſtianity*, which yet you make no uſe of in your *Fiat*. The words there from which you would *get countenance* unto your preſent evaſion are theſe. *Nowhere was ever Sermon made to formal Chriſtians either by St.* Peter *or* Paul *or any other, as the work of their Religion that they came together for; nor did the Chriſtians ever dream of ſerving God after their Converſion by any ſuch means, but* ONLY *by the Euchariſt or Liturgy.* Here is ſomewhat of *the work of their Religion which they came together for*, nothing of the *great work of their Chriſtianity*. Now that preaching was a work of their Religion that they came together for, though not *the only work* of it, nor *only end* for which they ſo convened, which no man ever dreamed that it was, and that the *Primitive* Chriſtians did by, and in that work *ſerve God*, hath been proved unto you from the *Scripture*. And all Antiquity with the whole ſtory of the Church, gives *atteſtation* to the ſame Truth. Sir it were far more *honourable* for you to renounce *a falſe and ſcandalous Aſſertion* when you are convinced that ſuch it is, then to ſeek to palliate it, and to

ſecure

ſecure your ſelf by ſuch unhanſome evaſions. *Preaching of the word unto believers* is an Ordinance of Chriſt, and that of indiſpenſible neceſſity unto their edification or growth in Grace and knowledge which he requireth of them. In the *practice* of this ordinance were the *Apoſtles* themſelves ſedulous, and commanded others ſo to be. So were they in the Primitive following times, as you may learn from the account given us of *Church meetings* by *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Tertullian* in their Apologies, and all that have *tranſmitted* any thing unto Poſterity concerning their Aſſemblies. For this end, to hear the word preached, Chriſtians came together, *not only*, or *ſolely*, or excluſively to the adminiſtration of other Ordinances, but as to a *part* of that worſhip which God required at their hands, and wherein *no ſmall part* of their ſpiritual advantage was enwrapped. To deny this, as you do in your *Fiat*, is to deny that the *Sun ſhines* at noon day, and to endeavour to dig up the very roots of Piety, Knowledge, and all Chriſtianity; to what ends and purpoſes, and for the enthroning of what other thing in your room, let all indifferent men judge. And I ſhall take leave to ſay, that to my beſt obſervation, I never met with an Aſſertion in any *Author* of what Religion ſo ever more remote from *truth*, ſobriety and modeſty then that of yours in your *Fiat*, pag. 275. *Nor did the Primitive Chriſtians for* 300. *years ever hear a Sermon made unto them upon a Text, but meerly flocked together at their Prieſts appointment unto their Meſſachs.* This I ſay is ſo *loudly* and notoriouſly untrue, and ſo known to be ſo, to all that have ever looked into the ſtories of thoſe times, that I am amazed at your confidence in the publiſhing of it. It may be you will hope to ſhelter your ſelf under the ambiguity of that expreſſion

expreſſion *made unto them upon a text.* Suppoſing that an inſtance cannot be given of that *mode* of preaching, wherein ſome *certain Text* is read at the entrance of a Sermon and principally inſiſted upon. But this *Fig leaf* will not cover you from the juſt Cenſure of knowing men. For 1. Their following adverſative, *but meerly*, is perfectly excluſive of all preaching be it of what *Mode* it will be. 2. The reading of *one certain Text* before Preaching is not neceſſary unto it, but all preaching is and ever was *upon ſome Text or Texts*, that is, it conſiſted in the explication and application of the word of God, that is, ſome part or portion of it. 3. Whereas it is certain that our Saviour himſelf *preached on a Text*, Luk. 4. 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. as alſo *did his Apoſtles*, Act. 8. 35. and the Fathers of the *following Ages*, it is ſufficiently evident that that was alſo the *conſtant mode* of preaching in the firſt 300. years, as may be made good in the inſtance of *Origen* and ſundry others.

You go on, and except againſt me for ſaying, *that we hear nothing of your Sacrifice of the Maſs in the Scripture*; and ſay you *will neither hear nor ſee*; *ſay you the paſſion of our Lord is our Chriſtian Sacrifice? do not I ſay ſo too? but that this incruent Sacrifice was inſtituted by the ſame Lord before his death to figure out daily before our eyes, that paſſion of his which was then approaching in commemoration of his death ſo long as the world ſhould laſt.*

I muſt deſire you to ſtay here a little; This Sacrifice you make the *main of Chriſtian Religion.* Proteſtants for the want of it, you eſteem to have *no Religion at all.* We muſt therefore conſider, what it is that you intend by it, for I ſuppoſe you would not have us *accept* of we know not what, and you ſeem both in your *Fiat* and in your *Epiſtola* to obſcure it

as

as much as you are able. 1. You call it an *incruent Sacrifice*, which (1.) Shews only *what it is not*, and that in one only inſtance which is a very lame deſcription of any thing; and this alſo may be affirmed of any *Metaphorical Sacrifice* what ever; as *offering unto God, the calves of our lips*; it *is an incruent Sacrifice*. 2. Your Expreſſion implyes a *contradiction*. Every *proper Propitiatory* Sacrifice was *bloody*; and an *incruent proper Sacrifice*, ſuch as you would have this to be, is a proper improper Propitiatory Sacrifice. 2. You ſay it *was inſtituted by our Lord to figure out his Paſſion*. (1.) This is a weighty proof of what you have in hand, being the *only thing* to be proved. (2.) I ſuppoſe in the examination of it, it will appear that you *Sacrifice that very body and bloed of Chriſt* in your own conceits, which himſelf offered unto God; and how you can make any thing, to be *a figure of it ſelf*, as yet I do not perfectly underſtand. (3.) That the Lord Chriſt appointed the *Sacrament* of his body and blood, and our *Euchariſtical Sacrifice* therein to be a Commemoration of his death and Paſſion, is the Doctrine of Proteſtants, where with your *Sacrifice* hath a perfect inconſiſtency, as we ſhall find in the Conſideration of it. This is the ſubſtance of what you are pleaſed to acquaint us with about *this great buſineſs of our Religion*. But becauſe you ſhall perceive that it was not without *good grounds* and reaſons that I affirmed the Scripture to be *utterly ſilent* of this that you make the great work of Chriſtianity, I ſhall a little further enquire after the nature of it; that I mean which by you it is fancied to be, for it is a mere creature of your own imagination.

1. You alwayes contend that it is *a proper Sacrifice which you intend*. The firſt *Canon* of your *Coun-*

cil

cil accurſeth them who deny it to be *verum & proprium Sacrificium*, a *True and proper Sacrifice*, wherein as they ſay before *Chriſtus inimolatur*, Chriſt is Sacrificed. Many things in the New Teſtament in reſpect of their *Analogy* unto the Inſtitutions of the old, are called *Sacrifices*, even almoſt all ſpiritual actions that are acceptable unto God in Chriſt. The *preaching of the Goſpel* unto the converſion of ſinners, is termed Sacrificing, Rom. 15. 16. So is *Faith it ſelf*, Phil. 2. 17. So *Prayers and Thankſgiving* are an oblation, *Heb.* 5. 7 chap. 13. 15. and *good works* are called Sacrifices, *Heb.* 13. 16. *Phil.* 4. 18. And our *whole Chriſtian Obedience* is intimated by *Peter* ſo to be. In the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* it is that you ſeek for your Sacrifice. And if you would be contented to call it, and eſteem it ſo, upon the account of its comprizing *ſome* of the things before mentioned, or meerly as a *ſpiritual action* appointed by God and acceptable unto him, there would be an end of this conteſt. But you muſt have it *a proper Sacrifice*, like thoſe of *Aaron* of old: not a *remembrance* of the Sacrifice of Chriſt, but a *Sacrifice of Chriſt himſelf*, wherein *Chriſtus immolatur*, Chriſt is ſacrificed, as the *Council* ſpeaks.

2. The Sacrifices of old were of two ſorts, 1. *Euchariſtical*, or Oblations of the fruits of the earth or other things, whereby the *Sacrificers* acknowledged God as the Lord and Author of all good things and mercies, with thanksgiving. 2. *Propitiatory* for the atoning of God, the reconciling him unto ſinners; for the turning away of his wrath and the impetration of the *pardon* of ſin. This was done *typically* and Sacramentally by virtue of their reſpect unto the *oblation* of Chriſt, by the old bloody Sacrifices of the Law; *really* and effectually by that *bloody Sacrifice*

Sacrifice which the Lord Jeſus Chriſt once offered for all. Now becauſe in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt* it is our Duty to offer up unto God our *thankeful prayers* for his unſpeakable love in ſending his only Son to dye for us, we do not contend with any, who on that accont, and with reſpect unto that peculiar act of our duty in it, ſhall call it an *Euchariſtical Sacrifice*, yea affirm it ſo to be. But you will have it a *propitiatory Sacrifice*, a Sacrifice of Atonement like that made by Chriſt himſelf; a Sacrifice for *the ſins of the living and the dead*, making reconciliation with God, obtaining Pardon of ſin, and eternal life, things peculiar to the *one Sacrifice* of Chriſt in his death and paſſion.

3. Though you uſually exclude the *communion* from it, wherein you do *wiſely*, that it may have no affinity with the Inſtitution of Chriſt, yet you do not *preciſely* determine your Sacrifice unto any *one act* or action in your *Maſs*, but make it comprize the whole with the manner of its celebration, from the firſt ſetting forth of the *Elements of bread* and wine mixed with water, unto the end of the *Offertory* after their *Tranſubſtantiation* and religious adoration thereupon, and their offering up unto God the *body and blood* of Chriſt under the *accidents* of bread and wine. The *preſentation* of the bread and wine, you would prove to belong unto your Sacrifice from the example of *Melchiſedeck*. Your *Tranſubſtantiation* is alſo of the *eſſence* of it: for it is required in a *Sacrifice* ſayes your *Bellarmine*, that the *ſenſible thing to be offered unto God be changed and plainly deſtroyed*. de Miſs. Lib. 1. cap. 2. which you eſteem the ſubſtance of your bread and wine to be in your *Tranſubſtantiation*. Your *religious adoration* of the conſecrated *hoſt* belongs alſo unto it, for

that

that in the *Canon of the Maſs* immediately enſues your *Tranſubſtantiating Conſecration*, before the oblation it ſelf, and ſo muſt neceſſarily be a part of your Sacrifice: Your *offering up unto God of Jeſus Chriſt*, praying him to accept of him at the Prieſts hands (*ſupra quæ propitio & ſereno vultu reſpicere digneris & accepta habere*) belongs alſo unto it. So doth your direction of it to the *propitiating* of God, and the expiation of the ſins of the Quick and the Dead; The *Ceremonies* alſo wherewith your *Maſſe* is celebrated, as I ſuppoſe, moſt of them belong to your *Sacrifice*; and thoſe who believe them not to be *duties of Piety*, are accurſed by your *Council* of *Trent*. The *Prieſts eating of the Hoſt* belongs to the Sacrifice, yea ſaith *Bellarmine*, it is *pars eſſentialis Sacrificii*, though not *tota eſſentia*, an *eſſential part of the Sacrifice, though the whole Eſſence* of it doth not conſiſt therein. I know you are at a great loſs and *variance* among your ſelves to find out what it is, that is *properly your Sacrifice*, or wherein the *eſſence* of it doth conſiſt. Some of your *diſcrepant* opinions are given us by your *Azorius* Lib. 10. Chap. 19. *Sunt* ſaith he, *qui putant rationem ſacrificii totam conſtitui in verbis, precibus, ceremoniis & ritibus, qui in conſecratione adhibentur, eo quod Sacrificii ratio, inquiunt, nequit in ipſa conſecratione conſiſtere, quin è contrario conſecratio ad rationem Sacramenti potius quam ad naturam Sacrificii pertinet. Alii exiſtimant Sacrificii rationem tribus Sacerdotis actionibus conſtare, conſecratione, oblatione & ſumptione. Alii quidem ſenſere ad rationem hujus Sacrificii quatuor imo quinque actiones concurrere, Conſecrationem, oblationem, fractionem, ſumptionem. Alii rationem Sacrificii ponunt in duobus actibus, conſecratione & oblatione. Alii conſtituunt totam rationem Sacrificii in unâ actione*

one, viz. *Conſecratione. There are who think the nature of the Sacrifice to conſiſt in the words, prayers, ceremonies and rites which are uſed in the Conſecration, becauſe ſay they the nature of the Sacrifice cannot conſiſt in the Conſecration it ſelf, which rather belongs unto the nature of a Sacrament then of a Sacrifice. Others think that the Sacrifice conſiſts in three actions of the Prieſt, Conſecration, Oblation and Sumption, or receiving of the Hoſt. Others in four or five, as Conſecration, Oblation, Fraction, Sumption. Others in two, Conſecration and Oblation; and ſome in one, Conſecration.* And is not this a *brave buſineſs* to impoſe on the Conſciences of all men, when you know not your ſelves what it is that you would ſo impoſe? A *Sacrifice* muſt be believed, and they are all *accurſed* by you that believe it not; but *what the Sacrifice* is, and *wherein* it doth conſiſt, you cannot tell. And an eaſie matter it were to manifeſt that all the *particulars* which you aſſign as thoſe that either belong neceſſarily unto the *integrity* of a Sacrifice, or thoſe wherein ſome of you, or any of you, would have *its eſſence* to conſiſt, are indeed of no ſuch nature or importance; but that is not my preſent buſineſs. I am only enquiring *what your Sacrifice* is according unto you own ſenſe and imagination. And that we may not miſtake, I ſhall ſet down ſuch a general deſcription of it, as the *Canon* of the *Maſs*, the general *rubrick* of the *Miſſal*, the rites and *cautels* of its celebration, will afford unto us. Now in theſe it is repreſented as a *ſacred action, wherein a proper Prieſt or Sacrificer, arrayed with various conſecrated attire, ſtanding at the Altar, taketh bread and wine, about which he uſeth great variety of poſtures and geſtures, inclinations, bowings, kneelings, ſtretching out and gathering in his arms, with a multitude of*

Croſſings, at the end and in the midſt of his pronunciation of certain words of Scripture, turns them into the real natural body and blood of Chriſt the Son of God, worſhiping them ſo converted with religious adoration, ſhewing them to the people for the ſame purpoſe, and then offering that body and blood unto God, praying for his acceptance of them ſo offered, and that it may be available for the living and the dead, for the pardoning of their ſins, and ſaving of their ſouls; after which he takes that body of Chriſt ſo made, worſhipped and offered, and eats and deavours it, by all which Chriſt is truly and properly Sacrificed.

This is the *Sacrifice* of your Church, wherein as you inform us, the *main* of your Devotion and Worſhip doth conſiſt. Of this Sacrifice I told you formerly the *Scripture* is ſilent; and I now add that ſo alſo is *Antiquity*. You cannot produce any one approved writer for the *ſpace of* 600. *years* that gives teſtimony to this your Sacrifice. For what ever *floriſh* you may make with the ambiguity of the word *Sacrifice*, which we cleared before, your *Tranſubſtantion* and other things aſſerted by you to belong unto the *integrity*, if not the *Eſſence* of your Sacrifice, are ſtrangers unto Antiquity, as hath been lately proved unto you, and will no doubt be yet further *confirmed* ſo to be.

I told you as you obſerve, that this Sacrifice is *an utter ſtranger to Scripture*, as alſo that it is inconſiſtent with what is therein delivered. The Apoſtle in the *Epiſtle* to the *Hebrews* plainly affirms that the Sacrifice of the Church of the Chriſtians is *but one*, and that *once offered for all*; whereas thoſe of the Jews by reaſon of their *imperfection* were often repeated; which you chooſe out to reply unto, and ſay, *It is true the Sacrifice of our Lords Paſſion*

of

of which the Apoſtle in that whole diſcourſe intends only to treat in oppoſition unto that of Bulls and goats, was ſo done but once, that it could not be done twice. But as the Sacrifices of the Old Law were inſtituted by Almighty God to be often iterated, before the Paſſion of the Meſſias for a continual exerciſe of Religion; ſo did the ſame Lord for the very ſame purpoſe inſtitute another to be iterated after his death, unto which it was to have reference when it ſhould be paſt, as the former had to the ſame death when it was to come. So you.

But firſt, This *begs* the Queſtion; for you only repeat and ſay that ſuch a *Sacrifice* was inſtituted by Chriſt, which you know is by us utterly denyed. (2.) It *plainly contradicts* the Apoſtle, and overthrows his whole argument and deſign. 1. It *contradicts* him in expreſs terms; for whereas he ſayes not only that *Chriſt once offered* himſelf, but alſo that he was *once offered* for all, that is, *no more to be offered*, you affirm that he is often offered, and that every day. 2. His deſign is to demonſtrate the *excellency* of the Condition of the Church of the *New Teſtament* and the worſhip of God therein above that of the Old. And this he proves to conſiſt here in a ſpecial manner, that they had *many Sacrifices* which were of neceſſity to *be reiterated* becauſe they could not take away ſin; for ſaith he, *if they could, then ſhould they not have been repeated, nor would there have been need* of any other Sacrifice. But, now ſaith he, this is done *by the one Sacrifice of Chriſt*, which hath ſo taken away ſin, as that it hath made the repetition of its ſelf, or the inſtitution of any other Sacrifice needleſs; and therefore we have no more but *that one*, and that one *once* performed. Now unleſs you will deny the Apoſtles Aſſertions, either

(1.) That *if one Sacrifice* can take away ſin, there is no need of another; or (2.) That *the one Sacrifice of* Chriſt did perfectly take away ſin as to Attonement: and alſo (3.) aſſert that the *condition* of the *Goſpel Church* is ſtill the ſame with that of the *Jews*, and that we have need of *a Sacrifice* to be repeated, not only as theirs was *year* by *year*, from whence he argues the imperfection of the greateſt ſolemn Sacrifice of *Expiation, but day by day* with a further and greater weakneſs, (repetition in the judgement of the Apoſtle being an evidence thereof) there will be no place left for *your Sacrifice*; that is, your main worſhip belongs not to the Church of God at all. (4.) You pretend that in this *worſhip* Chriſt himſelf is Sacrificed unto God, but *incruenter*, and without ſuffering: but the Apoſtle plainly tells us, that if he *be often offered*, he muſt *often ſuffer*, Heb. 9.26. And the *Sacrifice* of Chriſt, without his paſſion, his offering without ſuffering, evacuates both the one and the other.

But what of all this? if the *Apoſtles* uſed the *Sacrifice* you talk of, that of the *Maſs*, is it meet we ſhould do ſo alſo? Hereof you ſay, *were not the Apoſtles according to this rite* λειτουργοῦντες τῷ κυρίῳ *Sacrificing to our great Lord God, when* Paul *was by impoſition of hands ſegregated from the Layity to his Divine Service, as I clearly in my Paragraph evinced out of the Hiſtory of the Acts of the Apoſtles? No ſay you, the Apoſtles were not then about any Sacrifice, but only preaching Gods word or ſome ſuch thing to the people in the name and behalf of God. But Sir, is this to be in earneſt or jeſt? the ſacred text ſays they were Sacrificing to our Lord, liturgying and miniſtring unto him; you ſay they were not Sacrificing to God, but only preaching to the people. And now*

the

the Queſtion is whither you or I more rightly under-ſtand that Apoſtolical Book; for my ſenſe and mean-ing I have all Antiquity as well as the plain words of the ſacred Text; You have neither.

How empty and vain this Diſcourſe of yours is, wherein you ſeem greatly to *triumph*, will quickly be diſcovered. And you are a *merry man* if you think by ſuch arguments as theſe to perſwade us that the Apoſtles *Sacrificed* to God according to the *rite of your Maſs*, as though we did not know by whom the chief parts of it, particularly thoſe wherein you place *your Sacrifice*, were invented many hundreds of years after they fell aſleep. 1. You ſay they were λειτουργοῦντες τῷ κυρίῳ, *Sacrificing to our great Lord God*, as though it were *God the Father*, or God abſolutely that is intended in that expreſſion τῷ κυρίῳ *to the Lord*. ὁ Κύριος the Lord is Sir peculiarly *denotative* of the Perſon of the *Mediator*, Jeſus Chriſt, God and Man, according to that Rule given us by the Apoſtle, 1 Cor. 8. 6. *To us there is one God the Father,* καὶ εἷς Κύριος *and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And this is the conſtant *denotation* of the word, when uſed abſolutely as here it is, throughout the whole New Teſtament. To *Chriſt the Mediator* were the Churches miniſtring, *Act.* 13. That is *in his* name and Authority, according to his appointment, and unto his ſervice. And this one obſervation ſufficiently diſcovers the *vanity* of your Argument: for you will not ſay that they *offered Sacrifice* to the Lord Chriſt emphatically and *reduplicatively*, ſeeing if you may be believed it is he *whom they offered* in Sacrifice. Of ſuch force is the *Sophiſm* wherein you boaſt. And (2.) You wiſely obſerve that *Paul by the impoſition* of hands there mentioned was ſegregated from the *Layity*, whereas he tells you, that

he *was an Apoſtle*, (wherein certainly he was ſegregated from the Layity) *neither of men, nor by men, but by Jeſus Chriſt and God the Father*, Gal. 1. 1. that is, there was no intimation or interpoſition of the *Miniſtry* or Authority of any man in his call to that office, which he had for ſundry years exerciſed before this his *peculiar ſeparation* to the work of preaching anew to the Gentiles. So well are you skilled in the ſenſe of that *Apoſtolical Book*. 3. And not to inſiſt on the repetition of my former Anſwer, which in your *wonted manner* you lamely and unduly repreſent, could you by other Arguments and on other teſtimonies, prove that the *Sacrifice* you plead for was inſtituted by Chriſt, and offered by the Apoſtles, there might poſſibly be ſome colour for a man to think that they performed *that duty alſo* when they were ſaid λειτουργεῖν in the ſervice of God. But from that general expreſſion intimating any kind of *publick Miniſtry* whatever, and never uſed in any Author *ſacred* or *Prophane* preciſely and abſolutely to ſignifie *ſacrificing*, to conclude that they were *offering Sacrifice*, and to uſe no other teſtimony to prove they had any *ſuch Sacrifice*, is ſuch a fondneſs as nothing but inſuperable prejudice can perſwade a man in his right wits to give countenance unto. St. *Paul* tells us that the Magiſtrate is λειτουργὸς θεοῦ; doth he mean that he is *Gods Sacrificer*? or *his Miniſter*? And he ſayes of himſelf that he was λειτουργὸς τοῦ χριστοῦ, doth he intend that *he was Chriſts Sacrificer*? or *his Servant*? Rom. 15. 16. & v. 27. he ſayes that it was the duty of the Gentiles λειτουργῆσαι ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς, doth he mean to *Sacrifice in your carnal things*, or to *miniſter of them* to the Jews? (1.) But you will it may be except that they were not ſaid λειτουργεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ, as thoſe here (that is

the

the *Prophets* of the Church of *Antioch* and not the *Apoſtles* as you miſtake) are ſaid to do, to *liturgie* to the Lord; it muſt needs be *Sacrificing*, becauſe it was to the Lord. But 1. I have ſhewed you how this pretence is perfectly *deſtructive* of your own intendment, in that it is the *Lord Chriſt* that is eſpecially meant, unto whom *diſtinctly* you will not ſay they were ſacrificing. And (2.) Were it not ſo, yet the expreſſion would not give you the leaſt colour of advantage. What think you of, 1 *Sam.* 3. 1. καὶ τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ κυρίῳ ἐνώπιον Ἡλὶ, *and the child* Samuel *was Liturgying* (ſeeing you will have it ſo) *unto the Lord before Eli.* Do you think that the *child*, which was not of the family of *Aaron*, nor yet called to be a *Prophet* was *offering Sacrifice* to God, and the *high Prieſt* looking on? Do you not ſee the fondneſs of your pretenſion? (3.) I told you before, but now begin to fear that you are too old to learn what you do not like, that the 70. never tranſlated זבח *Sacrifice*, or to Sacrifice by λειτουργία or λειτουργῶ, nor intimate any *Sacrifice* anywhere by that word. And you may if you pleaſe now learn by the Inſtance of *Samuel*, that what men perform in the worſhip of God according to his command, they may be ſaid therein to *Miniſter unto or before the Lord in.* (4.) The note of your own *Cajetan* upon the place is worth your Conſideration, *non explicatur ſpecies Miniſterii, ſed ex eo quod dixerant (prophetæ & doctores) inſinuatur quod miniſtrabant Domino, docendo & prophetando*; *what kind of Miniſtry is ſpoken of is not explained, but by ſaying they were Prophets and Teachers (that were employed in it) it is inſinuated that they miniſtred unto the Lord by teaching and propheſying.* What have *Prophets* and *Teachers* to do with *Sacrifice*? if as ſuch they

they adminiſtred unto the Lord, they did it by *prophesying* and *teaching* which were accompanied by prayer. Here is no mention of *Sacrifice* nor work for Prieſts, ſo that the context excludes your ſenſe. The ſame is the interpretation of *Eraſmus*. (5.) Your vulgar Latine reads the words, *adminiſtrantibus Domino*, as they were *miniſtring unto the Lord*, excluding their notion of Sacrificing. And (6.) The *Syriack* tranſpoſeth the words and interprets the Sacrifice intended in them ובר הכוז צימיז הוי ושתבשטיז לאלהא and when they *were faſting and praying unto the Lord*. Praying (together with prophesying and preaching) was *their Miniſtry*, not *Sacrificing*. To the ſame purpoſe all *antient Tranſlations*, not one giving countenance unto your fancy. So well have you the *plain words of the ſacred Text* for you. (7.) Are you not aſhamed to boaſt that you have *all Antiquity* for your ſenſe and meaning? Produce any one antient Author, if you can, that gives the leaſt countenance unto it. This boaſting is uncomely becauſe untrue. *Bellarmine* out of whom you took your Plea from this place, and your qnotation of *Eraſmus* in your *Fiat*, cannot produce the *ſuffrage* of any one of the Antients for your interpretation of the words, no more can any of your *Commentators*. The *Homilies* of *Chryſoſtom* on that paſſage are loſt. *Oecumenius* is quite blank againſt you; ſo is *Cajetan*, *Eraſmus*, and *Vatablus* of your own: and do you not now ſee what is become of your boaſting? And are not your Countrymen beholding unto you, for endeavouring ſo induſtriouſly to draw them off from the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt, to place their Confidence and devotion in that which hath not the *leaſt footſtep* in Scripture or Antiquity, but is expreſly condemned by them both?

But

But to tell you my judgement, you will prevail with very few of them to anſwer your deſires. Will they judge it *meet* and equal think you to change a *bleſſed Sacrament* that Chriſt hath appointed, to embrace a *Sacrifice* that you have invented? to leave *calling upon God* according to the ſenſe of their wants with underſtanding, as they do in that Celebration of the *Euchariſt* which now they enjoy, to attend unto a *Prieſt ſometimes muttering*, ſometimes *ſaying*, ſometimes *ſinging* a deal of *Latine* whereof they underſtand never a word? To forego that *internal humility*, ſelf abaſement, and proſtration of ſoul unto God which they are enured unto in that Sacrament, to become *ſpectators* of the *Theatrical* geſtures of your Sacrificers? Beſides they are not able to comply with your requeſt, and to make your Maſs the *ſum of their Devotion* and worſhip of God, without offering the higheſt violence to their *Faith* as they are Chriſtians, their *Reaſon* as they are men, and that *Senſe* which they have in common with other Creatures. And what are you, or what have you done for them that you ſhould at once expect ſuch a profuſe largeneſs at their hands?

1. For your *Faith*, if it be grounded on the Scripture as every true *Proteſtants* is, your *Sacrifice* if admitted, will unqueſtionably evert it; To *accept of a worſhip* pretended to be of ſuch huge importance, as to be available for the *impetration of Grace*, Mercy, Pardon of ſins, removal of puniſhment, life eternal, for the living and the dead, *deſtitute* of all foundation in, or countenance from the Scripture, *abſolutely* inconſiſtent with their faith.

2. It is no leſs to have *a Sacrament* which is given unto us of God as a pledge and token of his Love and Grace, turned into *a Sacrifice*, which is a thing by

by us offered unto God and accepted by him, ſo that they differ as in other things, ſo in their *terms*, *à quo* and *ad quem*, from what they proceed, and by whom they are accepted.

3. Beſides they will quickly diſcover your pretenſions to be contrary unto what the *Scripture* teacheth them, both concerning the *Sacrifice of Chriſt* and alſo his inſtitution of his laſt ſupper, which is your Rule and comprizeth the whole of your Duty in the adminiſtration of it. They do not find that therein *Chriſt offered* himſelf unto *his Father*, but to *his Diſciples*; not to him to be accepted of him, but to them to be by faith received.

4. And whereas the Apoſtle expreſly affirms that *he offered himſelf but once*, if he offered himſelf a *Sacrifice in his laſt Supper*, you muſt maintain that he offered himſelf *twice*, unleſs you will deny his Sacrifice on the Croſs.

5. Moreover it is greatly oppoſite to your Countreymens *faith* about the *Prieſthood* of Chriſt and his real *Sacrifice*, which are to them things of that moment, that whoſoever ſhakes their faith in and about them, ſhakes the very foundations of their hope, conſolation and ſalvation. They have been taught that Chriſt remains *an High Prieſt* for ever, and the multiplication of *Prieſts* in ſucceſſion ariſing meerly from the mortality and death of them that preceded, they believe that no *Prieſt* can be ſubſtituted unto him in his office to offer a *proper Sacrifice* unto God, the ſame which he offered himſelf, without a ſuppoſition of an *inſufficiency* in him for his work. It is true there are perſons who in his name and Authority, as he is the *great Prophet* of the Church, do Miniſter unto it, whom ſome of them, either as the word may be an abreviation of *Preſbyter*, or out

of

of *analogy* unto them who of old ſerved at the altar, do call *Prieſts*; but that any ſhould intervene between God and Chriſt in *Sacrificing*, or the diſcharge of his *Prieſtly office*, you will not find your Countrymen ready to believe. For they are perſwaded there are as many *Mediators*, and *Sureties* as *Prieſts* or Sacrificers of the New Covenant.

6. Moreover they believe that the *Sacrifice of the Maſs* is an high derogation from the vertue and efficacy of the Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs, and to be ſet up in competition with it.

7. They are at a ſtand at the whole matter; to ſee you *turning bread and Wine* into that very body and blood of Chriſt which ſuffered on the Croſs, and then to *worſhip them*, and then to pray to God to accept at your hands that Chriſt which you have made, and then to *eat* him. But when they conſider that by ſo doing, you ſuppoſe your ſelves to *effect* that which they believe to be wrought only by the *blood of the Croſs of Chriſt* once offered for all, and therein fancy a Sacrifice of Chriſt, wherein he dyeth not, contrary to ſo many expreſs Teſtimonies of Scripture, they are utterly averſe from it. For whereas they look for *Redemption*, Forgiveneſs of ſins, and Reconciliation with God by the one Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs, wherein conſiſts the foundation of their hope and conſolation, becauſe it being abſolutely *perfect* was every way able and ſufficient without any repetition, as the Apoſtle teacheth them, *to take away ſin*, and for ever to conſummate them that are Sanctified, you teach them now to look for the ſame things from this *Sacrifice* of yours, which would make them queſtion the validity and perfection of that of Chriſt.

8. And

8. And when they have ſo done, yet they would ſtill be forced to queſtion the *validity* of yours, becauſe it is a pretended Sacrifice of Chriſt *without his death*, which they know to have been indiſpenſably required to render his Sacrifice valid and effectual.

9. And they cannot but think that this *repeated Sacrifice* being pretended to be for the very ſame ends and purpoſes with that of Chriſt himſelf, is very apt *to take off* the minds and confidence of men from that *one Sacrifice* performed ſo long ago, which they have not ſeen, and to fix them on that which their eyes daily look upon, as the *præſens numen* that they can immediately apply themſelves unto. Thus they fear that inſenſibly all faith of the true *Propitiation* wrought by Chriſt is obliterated, and that which they think an Idol ſet up in the room of it.

10. And which further troubles them, they are *jealous* that by this your *fiction* you quite overthrow the *Teſtament* of Chriſt, which certainly no man ought to endeavour the diſannulling of. For whereas in this *Sacrament* believers come to receive from him the great *Legacy of his body and blood*, with all the fruits of his death and Paſſion, you direct them to be *offering* and *Sacrificing* of them unto God, which quite alters the *Will* of our great Teſtator. And very many other things there are, wherein your *Countreymen* affirm that your Sacrifice is contrary to the faith wherein from Scripture they have been inſtructed, and that in things of the greateſt importance to their Conſolation here, and Salvation hereafter.

11. Neither is this all: your requeſt alſo lies croſs to your *Reaſon*, no leſs then to your Faith. For

For your *Sacrifice* cannot be performed, without a Suppoſition of a *change of the ſubſtance of the bread and wine into the ſubſtance of the body and blood of Chriſt*, and the ſubſtance of that body and blood, in every conſecrated Hoſt under the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, Chriſt himſelf alive being in every *Hoſt* and every *particle* of it. Hence many things they ſay enſue, which no man can poſſibly *admit of*, without offering violence unto the main Principles of that *Reaſon* whereby we are diſtinguiſhed from the beaſts that periſh. Some few of them may be inſtanced in.

1. *Accidents ſubſiſting without a Subject*, follows hence neceſſarily in the firſt place; ſo that there ſhould be *whiteneſs*, and nothing *white*; *length*, and nothing *long*; *breadth*, and nothing *broad*; *weight*, and nothing *heavy*. For all theſe *accidents* of Bread remain, when you would have them ſay that the *bread* is gone; ſo that there is left a *white*, *ſweet*, *long*, *broad*, *heavy nothing*. This your *Countreymen* cannot underſtand.

2. Beſides they ſay you hereby teach them, *that one and the ſame body of Chriſt which is in heaven, is alſo on the Altar*, not by an impletion of the whole ſpace between heaven and earth, that ſome part of it ſhould be in heaven, and ſome on earth; but that the one body which is in heaven, and whileſt it is there, is alſo on the *Altar* in the Accidents of Bread, which upon the matter is, that one and the ſame body is two, yea an hundred or a thouſand, according as in the *Maſs* you are pleaſed to multiply it. Now that *one and the ſame* body ſhould be *locally* divided or ſeparated from its ſelf, that whileſt *that one* body is on the Altar, that *other one* body which is the ſame, ſhould be in heaven, your Countreymen think to imply a Contradiction.

3. And

3. And ſo alſo they do that a *body* ſhould be in *any place*, and yet not as a body, but as a Spirit. For whereas you ſay that whole Chriſt is contained under each *Species* of Bread and Wine, and under every the moſt *minute* part of either *Species*, as your Council ſpeaks, you make the body of Chriſt to be whole in the whole, and whole in every part; when the very nature of a body requires that it have *partes extra partes*, its parts diſtinct from one another, and thoſe occupying their diſtinct particular places. But you make the *body of Chriſt* neither to be *compaſſed* in, nor to *fill* the place wherein it is, that is, to *be in a place*, and *not to be in a place*. For if it be a *body*, and be under the *Species* of bread and wine upon the *Altar*, *it is in* a place; and if it be not comprehended in that *ſpace* where it is, and doth fill it, it is *not in* a place, and therefore is there, and is not there at the ſame time.

4. And moreover we all know that the *Conſecrated wafer* bears no proportion to the true natural body of Chriſt, and yet this is ſaid to be *contained* under that. So that the body *contained* is much greater and farther extended, then *the body that contains it*, or the ſpace wherein it is; for it is ſo *under the Hoſt* as not to be elſewhere, unleſs in another Hoſt.

5. Nay it is in every *minute part* of the Hoſt, which multiplies contradictions in your Aſſertion.

6. Of the ſame nature is it that you are forced to *feign* the ſame body in 10000. *diſtant places* at the ſame time, and that with all *contradictory adjuncts* and affections. Now your *Countreymen* think that theſe and innumerable other conſequences of your *Tranſubſtantiation* which you preſuppoſe to your ſacrifice, or rather make it a principal part thereof, are

are ſuch as overthrow the whole *order of nature*, and being of things, and leave nothing certain among the Sons of men.

III. Their *ſenſe* is equally engaged againſt you with their *Reaſon*. Your *Hoſt* is *viſible*, *tangible*, *guſtible*; when they *ſee* it, they ſee *bread*; when they *feel* it, they feel bread; when they *taſte* it, they taſte bread; and yet you tell them it is not bread: whom ſhall they believe? if things be not as they ſee them, feel them, taſte them, it may be they are not men, nor do go on their feet, but are deceived in all theſe things, and ſuppoſe they ſee, perceive and underſtand what they do not. You tell them indeed that the *bread* is changed into the body of Chriſt, that body that was born of the *bleſſed Virgin*, and was crucified at *Jeruſalem*; that all taſte, length, breadth, weight is taken away from it, and that the taſte and weight of the bread is continued, which are the things they *ſee*, *feel* and *taſte*; but they likewiſe tell you, that your perſwaſion is an inveterate *prejudice* which you have blindly captivated your minds unto, and that if you would but give your ſelves the liberty of exerciſing any *reflex thoughts* upon your own acts, you would find that upon the ſuppoſitions you proceed on, you have not any juſt grounds to conclude your ſelves to be *living men*. For you teach men to deny and queſtion all that from Reaſon or Senſe you can inſiſt upon to prove that ſo you are. On theſe and the like accounts the *Encomiums* you give of your Sacrifice will ſcarce prevail with your *Countreymen* to relinquiſh all the worſhip of God, wherein they find daily comfort and advantage to their ſouls for the embracement of it.

CHAP.

CHAP. 20.

Of the Bleſſed Virgin.

UNto the ſixteenth Chapter of the *Animadverſions* directed to your Paragraph of the *Bleſſed Virgin*, you can find it ſeems nothing to ſay, and therefore betake your ſelf to clamorous revilings. All that you ſay in your *Fiat* on this head, is but an heap of *falſe accuſations* againſt Proteſtants for diſhonouring her; and all that you ſay in in your *Epiſtle* in its Vindication is railing at me for minding you of your miſcarriage. My whole Book you ſay is nothing but *calumnies, a bundle of ſlanders, a meer quiver of ſharp arrows of deſolation.* I am not ſorry that you are ſenſible that it hath *arrows* in it, tending to the deſolation of your Abominations. But I challenge you to give an inſtance of any *one calumny or ſlander in it*, from the beginning to the end. If you do not do ſo, I here declare you to be really and highly guilty of that which you would *falſly* impoſe upon another. *Free your ſelf* by ſome one inſtance it you can: if you cannot, your *reputation* will follow your *Conſcience* whether it will be hard for you to find them again. The ſubſtance of that Chapter is this, which is all that I ſhall now ſay to your nothing againſt it. *Proteſtants* yield to the *bleſſed Virgin* all the honour that the Scripture allows them, or direct them unto, or that the Primitive Church did aſcribe unto her, and the *Papiſts* give her the honour due to God alone, whereby they horribly diſhonour God and her.

CHAP.

CHAP. 21.

Images. Doctrine of the Council of Trent. *Of the ſecond* Nicene. *The Arguments for the Adoration of Images. Doctrine of the antient Church. Of the chief Doctrine of the Roman Church. Practice of the whole. Vain foundations of the pretences for Image Worſhip examined and diſproved.*

YOur next procedure is to your Diſcourſe of *Figures* or *Images*, and my Animadverſions upon it. And here you ſay, *you will come up cloſe unto me*; you mean in replying unto what I delivered about it; But Sir, I thought this had been contrary to your deſign; You profeſſed at the beginning of your *Epiſtle* that it was ſo, and have made good uſe of that declaration of your ſelf, by avoiding every thing in my diſcourſe that you found your ſelf preſſed with, and too *difficult a task* for you to deal withal. Why do you now begin to *forget* your ſelf and to caſt off the pretence you have hitherto ſhaddowed your ſelf under, and excuſed your ſelf by from tergiverſation? Surely you think you are upon *this head* able to ſay *ſomewhat to the purpoſe*, which you deſpaired of doing upon others of as great importance, and therefore now you may argue and diſpute, which before the *deſign of your Fiat* would not permit you to do. As far as I can obſerve, you ſpeak nothing at any time but what you think is at preſent for your turn. But whether it have any conſiſtency with that which elſewhere you have delivered, you make it not much your concernment to enquire. But we ſhall quickly ſee whether you had

any juſt ground of encouragement to *harneſs* your ſelf, and to come up, as you ſpeak, *cloſe to me* in this buſineſs or no. It may be before the cloſe of our Diſcourſe you will begin to think it had been as well for you to have perſiſted in your former avoidance, as to make this profeſſion of a *cloſe diſpute*; and whatever you pretend to the contrary, really you have done ſo. You *hide* the opinion and practice of your Church about the *Worſhip of Images* which you ſeem to be aſhamed of, inſtead of defending them; and *except* againſt ſome paſſages in my *Animadverſions* inſtead of *anſwering* the whole, which you ſeem to pretend unto. I ſhall therefore declare what is the *true judgement* of your Church in this matter, and then vindicate the *paſſages* of my Diſcourſe which you take notice of in your exceptions, and under both heads declare the abomination of your faith and practice in your Doctrine about Images and Worſhip of them.

The *Doctrine of your Church* in this matter I ſuppoſe we may be acquainted with from the *Determinations of your Councils*, the *explication* of your moſt famous Doctors, the *Practice* of your people, and the *diſtinctions* uſed by you to quit your ſelves from Idolatry in your Doctrine and Practice. And you will thereby learn, or may at leſt to what purpoſe it is for you to ſeek to palliate and *hide* the deformity of that which your Mother and her wiſe men have made naked to all the world.

Your *Council of Trent* is very wary in this matter, as it was in moſt of its other affairs: and indeed ſeeing it was reſolved not to give place to the Truth, it became it ſo to be, that it might keep any *footing* in the minds of men, and not tumble headlong into contempt and reproach. Many difficulties it had to

wreſtle

wreſtle withal. It ſaw the *practice* of their Church which was not totally to be deſerted, leaſt the great myſterie of its *Infallibility* ſhould be impaired, and its nakedneſs laid open: the general complaint on the other ſide of learned and ſober men, that under a pretence of *Image Worſhip* as horrible *Idolatry* was brought into the Church of God, as ever was practiced amongh the Heathen, did not a little perplex it. It had alſo the *various and contradictory opinions* of the great Doctors of your Church, and Maſters of your Faith about the *kind of Worſhip* which is due to Images, all which had great followers ready to diſpute endleſly in the maintenance of their ſeveral conceits. Amidſt theſe rocks and oppoſitions, the *Fathers* found no way to ſail ſafely, but by the help of *general and ambiguous words*; a courſe which in the like difficulties had frequently before ſtood them in good ſtead. Wherefore they ſo expreſſed themſelves, that no *party* at variance among them might think their opinions condemned, that the general *practice* of their Church might be countenanced, and yet no particular aſſerted that was moſt obnoxious to the exceptions of the *Lutherans*. Thus then they ſpeak, *Imagines porro Chriſti, Deiparæ Virginis & aliorum Sanctorum in Templis præſertim habendas & retinendas; eiſq; debitum honorem & venerationem impertiendam, non quod credatur——quoniam honos qui eis exhibetur refertur ad Prototypa, quæ illæ repreſentant*; with much more to that purpoſe. And we may obſerve, That the *Decree* ſpeaks only of the *Images of Chriſt*, the *bleſſed Virgin*, and *other Saints*, not expreſly mentioning the *Images of God the Father*, of the *Trinity*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*, nor of *Angels*, which they knew to be made, and to be had in veneration in their

Church, nor do they anywhere reject the uſe, makeing, or worſhipping of them. Yea in their following words they do plainly allow of the *figuring of the Deity*. *Quod*, ſay they, *ſi aliquando hiſtorias & narrationes ſacræ Scripturæ cum id indoctæ plebi expediet extrimi & figurari contigerit, doceatur populus, non propterea divinitatem figurari quaſi corporeã oculis conſpici, vel coloribus aut figuris exprimi poſſit.* The words are as moſt of the reſt in this particular, as *ambiguous* as the *Oracles of Delphos*. This cannot be denyed to be in them however, That *the unlearned people are to be taught, that the Deity is not painted or figured, as though it could be ſeen or expreſſed by colours, but for ſome other end*, as it ſeems for their inſtruction; which indeed is honeſt and fair dealing; for they plainly tell them that by their *pictures they teach them lyes*; the *language* of the Picture being, that God may be ſo pictured, whereby all your *pictures* and Images of God the Father as an *old man*, of the Trinity as *one perſon with three faces*, and the Holy Ghoſt as a *Dove*, are approved. 2. Religious Worſhip of Images is confirmed, *due honour and veneration or worſhip* is to be given unto them, ſaith the Council. Now it is not *mutual complement* they are diſcourſing about. There is no ſuch intercourſe between their Images and them ordinarily, though ſometimes civil ſalutations have paſſed between them; Nor is it any token of *Civil Subjection*, for Images have no eminency or authority of that kind; but it is *divine or religious veneration*, and worſhip which they affirm is to be aſſigned unto them. 3. They ſay that *due honour and veneration* that is religious, is to be aſſigned unto them; but what in eſpecial that honour and worſhip is, they do not determine; whither it be the ſame that is due

due to the *samplar* as some, the most of your Divines think, or whether it be an honour of *some inferiour nature* as others contend, *pugnant ipsi nepotes q*, the *Synod* leaves them where it found them, sufficiently at variance among themselves. 4. They further assert the worship that is given by them to Images to be *religious* or *divine*; in that they affirm the honour done to the Image, is referred unto the *Prototype* which it doth represent. Now suppose this be Jesus Christ himself; I suppose that they will grant that all the *honour* we yield to him by any way or means is *divine* or *religious*, and therefore so consequently that which they would have to be given unto his *Image*, (that is a stock or stone which they fancy so to be) must be so a so. Now Sir, you may see from hence, what it is that you are to speak unto and to defend, or else to hold your peace in this matter. And I shall yet make it a little more plain unto you. Your *Trent Council* approves and commends the *second Council of Nice* as that which taught and confirmed that *Doctrine and practice about Images*, and their Worship which your Church allows. I shall therefore briefly let you know what was the judgement of that Council, and what was the Doctrine and Practice confirmed in it, under many *dreadful Anathematisms*.

This *Second of Nice*, or *Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks*, as it is called by the *Council of Frankford*, whereunto we are sent by the *Tridentine Fathers* to be instructed in the *due Worship of Images*, was assembled by the Authority of *Irene* the Empress, a proud imperious woman, & her Son *Constantine*, whose eys she afterwards put out, and thrust him into a Monastery in the year, 490. *Tharasius* was then *Patriarch of Constantinople* and *Hadrian* the first *Bishop* or *Pope* of *Rome*. This

man moſt zealouſly or ſuperſtitiouſly addicted unto the worſhip of Images, and that contrary to the judgement of moſt of the *Weſtern Churches*, as ſoon afterwards appeared in the Council holden at *Frankford*, by the Authority of *Charls* the Great, had a particular advantage both over the *Empreſs* and the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*. The Eaſtern Empire being then greatly weakened by its own *inteſtine diviſions*, and preſſed on all ſides by the *Saracens*, the Empreſs began to entertain ſome hopes of relief from the *French* in the *Weſt*, whoſe power was then grown very great: and to that end ſollicited a marriage for her Son with the daughter of *Charls* the great; and ſuppoſed that ſhe might be helped therein by the mediation of *Hadrian*: the Biſhops of *Rome* having no ſmall hand in the promotion of the attempt of *Pipin* and *Charls* the Great for the Crown of *France*, and afterwards for the conqueſt of *Italy* and *Germany*. And beſides, ſhe was a woman her ſelf *zealouſly* addicted to that kind of ſuperſtition which *Hadrian* had eſpouſed, as having in the time of *Leo* her Husband kept her *Images* in private, contrary unto what ſhe had ſolemnly ſworn unto her Father, as *Credenus* relates in his Annals. As for *Taraſius*, he was contrary to all *Eccleſiaſtical Canons*, of a meer Lay-man at once *per ſaltum* made *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, which *Hadrian* upon his firſt hearing of, greatly exclaimed againſt, and refuſed to receive him into the ſociety of *Patriarchs* upon his ſending of his ſignificatory Epiſtle. This is fully declared in the *Epiſtle of Hadrian* extant in the *Acts* of the Council. But yet afterwards bethinking himſelf how uſefull this man might be unto his deſign in getting the *worſhip of Images* eſtabliſhed in the *Eaſt*, he declares that if he will uſe means to

get

get the *Hereſie* as he called it of the *Image-oppoſers* extirpated, and their *veneration* eſtabliſhed, he would conſent to his *Election* and Conſecration, or elſe not. Finding how the matter was like to go with him, this *Lay-Patriarch* undertakes the work and effectually proſecutes it in this Synod aſſembled at *Nice* by the Authority of *Irence* the Empreſs and her Son *Conſtantine*. But by the way, when the *Council* was aſſembled, he omitted not the opportunity of improving his own intereſt, getting himſelf ſtiled *Oecumenical*, or *Univerſal Patriarch*, which *Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius* in his dedication of his *Tranſlation* of the Acts of this Convention unto *John* the eighth, bewayles, and aſcribes it unto the *flattery of the Greeks*. The frauds, forgeries and follies of this Council, and ignorance and dotage of the Fathers of it, have been ſufficiently by others diſcovered. Our preſent concernment is only to enquire, Firſt, *What they taught* concerning Image Worſhip: and Secondly, *How they proved* what they taught, ſeeing unto them we are ſent by the *Tridentine* Decree to be inſtructed in *your faith* in this matter.

Firſt, They make the *having* and *uſe of Images* in the Worſhip of God of indiſpenſible neceſſity, ſo that they *anathematize* and caſt out of the Communion of the Church, all that refuſe to receive and uſe them according to their preſcript. Yea, they proceed ſo far as in their approbation of the Confeſſion of *Theodoſius the Biſhop of Ammoria*, as to denounce an *Anathema* againſt them that do but doubt of their reception: πᾶσι ἀμφίβολον ἔχειν τὴν διάνοιαν ἢ μὴ ἐν ψυχῇ ὁμολογεῖν προσκυνεῖν τὰς σεπτὰς εἰκόνας ἀνάθεμα: ſo he cloſeth his Confeſſion which they all approve as Orthodox, *Anathema to them*

that are ambiguous or doubtful in their minds, and do not confess with their hearts (ex animo) *that Sacred Images are to be worshipped*; wherein they and and you with them add *Schism* to their *Idolatry*, casting out of the Churches those who offend neither against the *Gospel*, nor the determination of any *General Council* of old; making the Rule of your Communion to consist in a sorry piece of Will-worship of your own invention; which doubles the crime of your *Superstition*, and layes an intolerable intanglement upon the Consciences of men, which are perswaded from the Scripture, that they shall be *accursed* of God if they do receive Images into his Worship, after the manner of your prescription.

Secondly, They affirm an hundred times over, that *Images are religiously to be adored and worshipped*, that is, with Divine Worship. So in the Confession of the same *Theodosius*, ὁμολογῶ καὶ συντίθεμαι καὶ δέχομαι καὶ ἀσπάζομαι, καὶ προσκυνῶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and so of the rest: *I confess, consent unto, receive, embrace or salute, I worship or adore the Image of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Blessed Virgin, and of the Apostles and Martyrs.* The same is affirmed in the Epistle of *Hadrian* recited in the *second Act* of the Synod, which they all approve; and afresh *curse* all them that *dogmatize* or teach any thing against that worship of Images. And *Gregory* the *Monk* no small man amongst them, affirms that he hoped by his Confession of this Doctrine he believed, he *should obtain the forgiveness of his sins*, Act. 2. And *John* who falsly pretended himself to be delegated from the *Oriental Patriarchs*, when he was sent only by a few ignorant Monks of *Palestine*, prefers Images above the Word its

self,

ſelf, *Act.* 4. ὥστε μείζων ἡ εἰκὼν τῦ λόγυ; *an Image is greater then the word*; and again ἰσοδυναμῶσι αἱ τίμιαι εἰκόνες τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, *honourable Images are equivalent to the Goſpel.* And they prove the worſhip they intend to be divine by their wiſe explication of that Text, *The Lord thy God ſhalt thou worſhip, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, ὅτι μὲν τῷ λατρέυσεις προσέθηκε τὸ μόνον, ὅτι δὲ τῷ προσκυνήσεις ἁπλῶς; ὥστε προσκυνεῖν μὲν ἔξεστι, λατρέυειν δὲ ἁπλῶς. *Unto the Word Thou ſhalt ſerve, only is ſubjoyned, but not unto the word Worſhip*; *ſo that it is lawfull to worſhip (Images) but not to ſerve them.* A wiſe buſineſs! but it diſcovers ſufficiently what is the worſhip which they aſcribe unto Images, even *the ſame that is given unto God*; for if we may believe them, *other things* are not excluded from Communion with God in this matter of worſhip and adoration. Whence the *Council of Frankeford* doth expreſly charge them, that they taught that *Images were to be adored with the honour due to God*, *Act.* 4. And ſo much weight do they lay upon this *devotion* that they approve the Councel given by *Theodorus the Abbot* unto the *Monk* whom the Devil vexed with temptations for worſhipping the Image of Chriſt, who told him that *he had better reſort to all the Stews in the Town, then ceaſe worſhipping of Chriſt in his Image*; συμφέρει σοι μᾶλλον καταλιπεῖν εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν πάντας πορνεῖον εἰ ὃ μὴ εἰσέλθῃς, κλ: *it ſeems it was uncleaneſs* that the Devil tempted him unto, as well knowing that Spiritual and Corporal fornication commonly go together.

Thirdly, In every *Seſſion* they inſtance in ſome particulars wherein the Adoration of Images which they profeſſed did conſiſt; as in particular in *religious ſaluting* of them, *kiſſing of them*, *bowing before*

fore them, and ſo adoring of them. To this purpoſe their words are very expreſs. Now all theſe were ever eſteemed *tokens*, pledges and expreſſions of *Religious or Divine Worſhip*, and were the very wayes whereby the *Heathen of old* expreſſed their veneration of their Images and Idols. *Job* intimating the way whereby they worſhipped the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *hoſt of Heaven*, which crimes he denyes himſelf to be guilty of, tells us, *that when he conſidered the Sun and the Moon, his heart did not ſeduce him that he ſhould put his hand to his mouth*, that is to ſalute them; for this, ſaith he, *had been to deny God above*, Job 31. 26, 27. As *Catullus*,

Conſtiteram Solem exorientem ſorte ſalutans,
Cum ſubito à læva Roſcius exoritur.

He ſtood *ſaluting*, or worſhipping the riſing Sun. And that alſo was their meaning in *kiſſing* of them, or *kiſſing* their hands in ſaluting of them, Hoſ. 13. 2. *Let them kiſs the Calves*, that is worſhip them; expreſs their religious adoration of them by that outward ſign. As *Cicero* in Ver. 4. *Herculis ſimulacrum non ſolum venerari, ſed etiam oſculari ſoliti fuerunt.* So *Minutius Felix* tells us, that his companion *Cæcilius* coming where the Image of *Serapis* was ſet up, *admovit manum ori & oſculum labris preſſit, put his hand to his mouth and kiſſed it*, as worſhipping of it. And for *creeping*, *kneeling*, or *bowing*, it is ſo certain an evidence of Divine Worſhip, that all Worſhip both falſe and Idolatrous or true, is oftentimes expreſſed thereby. So the worſhipping of *Baal*, is called *bowing the knee to Baal*. They that bowed the knee unto him or his Image, in their ſo doing worſhipped him, 1 *Kings* 19. 18. *Rom.* 11. 4. And where God promiſeth to bring all Nations to the

the worſhip of himſelf he ſayes, *they ſhall bow the knee to him*, Rom. 14. 11. So that theſe are all expreſſions of *Religious worſhip*, and they are all *accurſed* over and over by the *Council*, who do not by theſe means expreſs their worſhip of Images. This is the Doctrine, this is the practice which the *Tridentine* decree aprroves of, and ſends us to learn of the *ſecond Synod of Nice*. And this they expreſs in moſt places, in thoſe very termes, that were uſed by the *Pagans* in the worſhip of their *Idols*, making indeed no diſtinction, but that whereas the *Pagans* worſhipped the images of *Jupiter* and *Minerva* and the like, they in the like manner worſhipped the *Images* of *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. And therefore in the *Indies*, the Catholick Spaniards took away the *Zemes* or Images of their Idols, that the poor natives had before, and gave them the Images of Chriſt and his Mother in their ſtead.

This being the *Doctrine* of the *Council* it may not be amiſs to conſider a little how they *proved* and confirmed it. Two things they principally inſiſted on. 1. *Teſtimonies of Scripture*. 2. *Miracles*. Some ſayings alſo they produced out of ſome antient writers of the Church, but all of them either perverted or forged. The Scriptures they inſiſted on were all of them gathered togethered in the *Epiſtle of Pope Hadrian*, which was ſolemnly aſſented unto by the whole Council. And they were theſe. *God made man of the duſt of the Earth after his own Image*, Gen. 1. Abel *by his own choiſe offered a Sacrifice unto God of the firſtlings of his flock*, Gen. 4. Adam *of his own mind called all the beaſts of the field by their proper names*, Gen. 2. Noah *of his own accord built an altar unto the Lord*, Gen. 8. Abraham *of his own free will erected an altar to the Glory of God*, Gen. 11. Jacob

having

having seen in his sleep seen the Angels of God ascending and descending by the ladder, set up the stone on which his head lay for a pillar, Gen. 28. And again, *he worshipped on the top of his staffe*, Gen. 29. Moses *made the brasen Serpent, and the Cherubims*; Esaiah, saith *in those dayes there shall be an Altar unto the Lord, and it shall be for a sign and a Testimony*, Chap. 19. David *the Psalmist* sayes, *Confession and beauty are before him; and again, Lord I have loved the beauty of thine house. And again, Thy face Lord will I seek*, Psal. 26. *And again, The rich among the people shall bow themselves before thy face*, Psal. 44. *And again, The light of thy Countenance is signed or lifted up upon us*, Psal. 4. *Si hoc non sit testimoniorum satis, ego nescio quid sit satis*: he must be very refractory, and deserve a world of *Anathematismes* that is not convinced by all these testimonies, that *Images ought* to be worshiped. But, *quod non dant proceres, dabit Histrio*; if the *Scripture* will not do it, *Miracles* shall: Of these we have an endless number heaped up by the good fathers to prove their Doctrine, and justifie their practice. The worst is that *Tharasius* almost spoiles the *market*, by acknowledging that the *images in their dayes* would work none of the miracles they talked of, so that they had them all upon hearesay, Act. 4. ἀλλὰ saith he, μήτις εἴπῃ τίνος ἕνεκεν αἱ παρ' ἡμῖν εἰκόνες οὐ θαυματουργοῦσι· πρὸς ὃν ἀποκρινούμεθα, ὅτι καθὼς ὁ Ἀπόστολος εἴρηκεν, ὅτι τὰ σημεῖα τοῖς ἀπίστοις οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσι· *But if any should say, Why do our images work no miracles? to them we answer, because as the Apostles saith Signes are for unbelievers, not for them that believe.* And yet the misadventure of it is, that the most of the *Miracles* which they report and build their faith upon, were wrought as by so amongst their chiefest believers. And what were the Miracles themselves they

they boaſted of? ſuch a heap of traſh, ſuch a fardle of lyes, as the like were ſcarce ever heaped together, unleſs it were in the *Golden Legend*. *Hadrian* inſiſts on the *leproſie* and *cure* of *Conſtantine*, as loud a lye as any in the *Talmud* or *Alcoran*. *Theodorus* of *Myra*, tells us of a Deacon that *dreamed he ſaw one in his ſleep whom he took to be St.* Nicholas, Ac. 4. Another tells us a tale of one that *ſtrock a nail in the forehead of an image, and was troubled with a pain in his head untill it was pulled out.* Another dreamed, *that the bleſſed Virgin brought* Coſma *and* Damiana *to him and commanded them to cure him of his diſtemper*; One mans *daughter*, anothers *wife*, is helped by thoſe images. And they all conſent in the ſtory of the Image of Chriſt made without hands, or humane help by God alone, (θεοπλαστος) that he ſent to *Abgarus* King of the *Edeſſenes*; as bellowing a lye as any in the herd. So true was it, that the *Council* of *Franckeford* affirmed of this Idolatrous Conventicle, that they endeavoured to confirm their *ſuperſtition* by feigned wonders and *old-wives* tales.

Sir, This is the Doctrine, this the Confirmation of it, which we are directed unto, and enjoyned to embrace by your *Tridentine decree*. This is that, yea and more alſo, as you will hear by and by, that you are bound to *maintain* and make good, if you intend to ſay any thing to the purpoſe about *figures* or Images; For you muſt not think by your *ſleight floriſhes* to blind the eyes of men in theſe dayes as you have done formerly. Own your Doctrine and practice, or renounce it; This Tergiverſation is ſhameful; and you will yet find your ſelf farther preſſed with the doctrine of Chiefeſt pillars of your Church, and the publick practice of it. For though

this

this *ſuperſtitious Conventicle* at *Nice*, departed from the faith of the antient Church, and was quickly reproved, and convinced of folly by perſons of more *learning*, *ſobriety* and modeſty then themſelves in the very age wherein they lived, yet it roſe not up unto the *half* of the Abominations, in the filth and guilt whereof your Church hath ſince rolled it ſelf. And yet becauſe I preſume you are well pleaſed with theſe *Nicenians*, who gave ſo great a lift to the ſetting up of your *Idols*, I ſhall give you a brief account, both what was the judgement and practice of them that went before them in this matter, as alſo of ſome that followed after them, with joynt conſent deteſting your folly and ſuperſtition. You tell us ſomewhere in your *Fiat*, that the Primitive Chriſtians had the *picture* or half portraiture of Chriſt upon their Altars. I ſuppoſe you did not invent it your ſelf; I wiſh you had told us of the Legend that ſuggeſted it unto you. For you ſeem in point of ſtory to be converſant in ſuch *learned Authors*, as few can trace you in. If you pleaſe to have a little patience, I ſhall mind you of ſome that give us another account of things in thoſe dayes.

1. Some there are, of the firſt Chriſtians, who give us an account of the *whole worſhip of God* with the manner and form of it, which was obſerved in their Aſſemblies in their dayes. So doth *Juſtin Martyr* in his *Apologies*, *Tertullian* in his, *Origen* againſt *Celſus* with ſome others. Now in none of theſe, is there any one word concerning *Images*, their uſe, or their *worſhip* in the ſervice of God, although they deſcend to deſcribe very *minute particulars* and circumſtances of their way and proceeding.

2. Some there are, who give an account of the perſecutions of *ſeveral Churches*, with the out-rages of the

the *Pagans* againſt their Aſſemblies, the Scriptures, all the ordinances and worſhip, as do thoſe *golden fragments* of the firſt and beſt Antiquity, the *Epiſtles* of the Churches of *Vienna* and *Lions*, to the pariſhes of *Aſia*, of the Church of *Smyrna* about the Martyrdome of *Polycarpus*, preſerved and recorded by *Euſebius*; and yet make no mention of any *figures*, pictures, or Images of *Chriſt*, the *Bleſſed Virgin* or his Apoſtles, or of any *rage* of their adverſaries againſt them, or of any *ſpite* done unto them, which they would not have omitted, had there been any ſuch in uſe amongſt them.

3. There are beſides theſe ſome unqueſtionable remnants of the conceptions that the *Wiſeſt* and ſobereſt of the *heathen* had concerning the Chriſtians and their worſhip: as in the Epiſtles of *Pliny* about their *Aſſemblies*, and the reſcript of *Trajan*, as alſo in *Lucian Philopatris*; in none of which is any intimation of the *Nicene Images* or their Adoration. It may be you will undervalue this conſideration, becauſe built upon teſtimony *negatively*, when it doth not follow, that becauſe ſuch and ſuch mentioned them not, therefore they were not then in uſe or being. But Sir, an Argument taken from the *abſolute ſilence* of all approved Authors, concerning any thing of importance, ſuppoſed to be or happen in their dayes, and who would have had juſt occaſion to make mention of it, had any ſuch thing then been in *rerum naturâ*, is as great an evidence, and of as full a certainty, as the *monuments* of times are capable of. Is it poſſible for any *rational man* to conceive, that if there had been ſuch an *uſe* and veneration of Images in the primitive Churches as is now in the *Roman*, or that the reception and veneration of them was made the *teſſara* of Church Communi-

on,

on, as it is by the (*Nicene Conventicle*, that all the first Writers of Christianity treating expresly and purposely of the *Assemblies of the Christians* and the worship of God in them, with the manner and circumstances thereof, would have been *utterly silent* of them; or that those who set down and committed to record all the particularities of the *Pagans rage* in scattering their *Assemblies*, would not drop one word of any indignity shewed to any of their *sacred images*, when they pass not by their wrath against their *houses*, goods and cattel? Such things are fond to imagine.

2. *Many* of the Antients, do note it as an *abomination* in some of the *first Hereticks*, that they had introduced the *use of Images* into their worship, with the adoration of them. *Theodoret. haret. sub. lib.* 1. tells us, that *Simon Magus gave his own image and that of* Selene to be worshipped by his followers. And *Irenæus*, *Lib.*1.*cap.*23. that the followers of *Basilides* used images and invocations: and *cap.* 24. that the *Gnosticks* had images both painted ones and carved, and that of Christ, which they said was made originally by *Pontius Pilate*, and this they adored. And so doth *Epiphanius* also, *Tom.* 2. *lib.* 1. *Hær.* 27. *Carpocrates* procured the images of *Christ* and *Paul* to be made and adored them: and the like is recorded of others. Now do you think they would have observed and reproved this practice as an *abomination* in the *hæreticks*, if there had been any thing in the *Churches usage* that might give countenance thereunto? or at least that they would not have distinguished between *that abuse of images*, which they condemned in the hereticks, and that *use* which was retained and approved among themselves. But they are *utterly silent*, as unto any such

ſuch matter, contenting themſelves to report and reprove the ſuperſtition and idolatry of the *Heretick*s in their *Adoration* of them. But this is not all.

3. They poſitively deny that they had *any images* or made any uſe of them, and defend themſelves againſt the *charge of the Pagans* againſt them for profeſſing an *imageleſs* Religion. *Clemen. Alexand. Strom. Lib.* 6. plainly and openly confeſſeth and teſtifieth, that *Chriſtians had no Images in the world.* And in his *Adhortat. ad Gent. he poſitively aſſerts* that the arts of Painting and Carving as to any *religious* uſe were forbidden to Chriſtians, and that in the worſhip of God they had no *ſenſible image* made of any ſenſible matter, becauſe they worſhipped God with underſtanding. What was the judgement of *Tertullian*, is known from his book *de Idololatria*, from whence if we ſhould tranſcribe what is *argumentative againſt image worſhip*, very little would be remaining. But of all the Antients *Origen* doth moſt clearly manifeſt what was the *doctrine* and practice of the Church of God in his dayes; as in other places, ſo in his ſeventh book againſt *Celſus* he directly handles this matter: *Celſus* charged the Chriſtians, that they made uſe of no *images in the worſhip of God*, telling them that therein they were like the *Perſians*, *Scythians*, *Numidans* and *Seres*, all which impious nations hated all images, as the *Turks* do at this day. To which diſcourſe of his, *Origen* returning anſwer, grants that the Chriſtians *had no images* in their ſacred worſhip, no more then had the *Barbarous* nations mentioned by *Celſus*; but withall adds the difference that was between thoſe and theſe; and tells you, that their *abſtinence* from *Image worſhip* was on various accounts. And after he hath ſhewed

wherefore thoſe Nations received them not, he adds *that Chriſtians and Jews abſtained from all ſacred uſe of Images becauſe of Gods command. Thou ſhalt fear* (as he reads the text) *the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*; and thou *ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven image, nor the likeneſs of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath*; and adds, that they were ſo far from praying to the images as the Pagans did, that ſaith he, ὑπῆρχεν τὰ ἀγάλματα, a thing expreſly commanded in the *Nicene Conventicle, we do not give any honour at all to Images*, leaſt *We ſhould give countenance to the error of ignorant people, that there were ſomewhat of Divinity in them*; with very much more to the ſame purpoſe, expreſly condemning all the uſe of Images in the worſhip of God, and openly teſtifying that there was no ſuch uſage among the Chriſtians in thoſe dayes heard of in the world. *Arnobius* or *Minutius Felix* acknowledgeth the ſame; *Cruces nec colimus nec optamus, we do no more worſhip Croſſes then deſire them*, and grants that Chriſtians had *nulla nota ſimulachra*, becauſe no image could be made to or of him whom alone they worſhipped. What was the judgement of the *Elibertine Council* I have before told you. *Lactantius* in his *Inſtitut. ad Conſtant. lib.* 2. by an happy anticipation, anſwers *all the arguments* that you *uſe to* this day, in defence of your image worſhip, and concludes peremptorily, that *where there are any Images, there is no Religion*; ſhewing how perverſe a thing it is that the image of *a dead man* ſhould be worſhipped by a *living image* of God. The time would fail me to relate the words of *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Hilarius*, *Ambroſius*, *Cyrillus*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Epiphanius*, *Hierom*, *Auſtin*, and others to the ſame purpoſe. I cannot but think that

it

it is fully evident to any one that conſults *antiquity*, that the image uſe and worſhip, which is become the *Teſſera* of your Church Communion, by your eſpouſing the *Canons* and Determinations of the *ſecond Nycene Synod*, was in part utterly unknown unto, and in part expreſly condemned by the whole Primitive Church for 600. *years* after Chriſt; and that you have plainly by your *Tridentine decree* and *Nicene Anathematiſmes* cut off your ſelves from the Communion of the Catholick Church of Chriſt, and all particular Aſſemblies that worſhip him in ſincerity, for the ſpace of ſome hundreds of years in the world.

Thus things went in the Church of God before your *Nicene Convention*. How did they ſucceed afterwards? did image worſhip preſently *prevail* upon their determinations? or was that then the faith of the generality of the Church of Chriſt, which was declared by the *fathers* of that Convention? nothing leſs; no ſooner was the rumor of this *horrible innovation* in Chriſtian Religion ſpread abroad in the world, but that upon it there was a full aſſembly of 300. *Biſhops* of the Weſtern Provinces aſſembled at *Franckeford* in *Germany*, wherein the *ſuperſtition* and folly of the *Nicene Aſſembly* was layed open, their Arguments confuted, their determinations rejected, and image worſhip abſolutely condemned, as forbidden by the word of God, and contrary to the Antient conſtant known practice of the whole Church of God.

And now Sir as I ſaid you may begin to ſee what you have to do, if you intend to ſpeak any thing to the purpoſe concerning your *figures* and Images. You muſt take the Decree of your *Council* of *Trent*, and the *Nicene Canons* therein confirmed, and

prove, confirm, and vindicate them from the oppoſition made to them by *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, *Origen*, *Lactantius*, the *Synod of Franckeford* and others of the Antients innumerable by whom they are rejected and condemned; and yet when you have done ſo, if you are able ſo to do, your work is not one quarter at an end. You can make nothing of this *buſineſs* untill you have confuted or burned the *Scripture* it ſelf, wherein your *Image making* and *Image worſhip* is as fully condemned as it is poſſible any ſuperſtition or Idolatry ſhould be. Your preſent *looſe diſcourſes*, whereby you endeavour to poſſeſs the minds of unwary men, that you do not do that which indeed you do every day, and which almoſt all the world know that you do, and which you curſe others for not doing, will not with conſidering perſons redound at all unto your advantage.

2. That you may the better alſo diſcern what is *incumbent* on you, and expected from you the next time you talk of *figures*, I ſhall make bold to mind you of what is the Doctrine of the chief *Maſters* and Inſtructors of your Church, from whence certainly we may better learn what the Doctrine and practice of it is, then from *one* who diſcovers enough in what he ſayes and writes, to keep us from laying any great weight on his authority. Now I confeſs that you do in this, as in ſundry other points of your Religion, give us an egregious *ſpecimen* of that *conſent* and unity among your ſelves which you ſo frequently boaſt of. *Raphael de Torre* in his *Sum. Relig. Queſt.* 94. *Artic.* 2. *diſput.* 6. *dub.* 5. gives us an account of five ſeveral opinions maintained by your *Doctors* in this matter, of all which he rejects that only of *Durand* and ſome others, affirming that *images* are not worſhipped *properly* but only improperly

perly and *abuſively*, as raſh and ſavouring of hereſie The ſame doth *Bellarmine* alſo; and the Truth is that that opinion of *Durrand*, *Gerſon*, and ſome others is plainly condemned by the *Tridentine Decree*, as hath been already declared. The Authors of the other four opinions, though they differ among themſelves and have ſeveral *digladiations* about ſome expreſſions and diſtinctions framed meerly in their own imaginations, agree well enough, that *Images are religiouſly to be worſhipped.* Worſhipped religiouſly they are to be, but whither *per ſe* and *abſolutely*, *directly* and *ultimately*, whither with the *ſame kind* of worſhip wherewith that is to be worſhipped which they repreſent, they are not ſo fully agreed as might be deſired in a matter of this importance. For it is juſtly to be feared that whileſt your *Doctors* are wrangling, your people are committing as groſs Idolatry as any of the Heathen were guilty of. In the mean time, the moſt prevalent Opinion of your Doctors is that of *Thomas* and his followers, that *images are to be adored with the ſame kind of worſhip wherewith that which they repreſent is to be worſhipped.* And therefore whereas the Lord Chriſt is to be worſhipped with *Latria*, that which is peculiar in your judgement to *God* alone, it follows ſaith he, that his *image* is to be worſhipped with the ſame worſhip alſo. And as ſome of your learned men do boaſt, that this indeed is the only approved opinion in this matter in your Church; ſo the truth is, if you will ſpeak *congruouſly* and at any *conſiſtency* with your ſelves it muſt be ſo. For whereas you lay the foundation of all your worſhip of them, be it of what ſort it will, in that *figment*, that the honour which is done to the image redounds unto him whoſe image it is, if the honour done to the *image*

be of an inferior ſort and kind unto that which is due unto the *exemplar* of it by referring that honour thereunto, you debaſe and diſhonour it, by aſcribing *leſs* unto it then is its due. If then you intend to anſwer juſt expectation in this matter, the next time you ſpeak of *figures* pray conſider what your *Thomas* teacheth as the Doctrine of your Church, 3. *p. q.* 25. *a.* 3. which *Azorius* ſayes is the conſtant judgement of Divines, *lib.* 9. *cap.* 6. As alſo the expoſition of the *Tridentine* Decree by *Suarez Tom.* 1. *d.* 54. §. 4. *Vaſquez, Coſterus, Bellarmine* and others. And

3. You may do well to conſider the practice and uſage of your *Catholick people* all the world over, eſpecially in thoſe places where you have preſerved them from being *diſturbed* in their Devotion, by the Arguments and exceptions of Proteſtants, as alſo the direction that is given them for the exerciſe of their Devotion in that preſcription of *Rites* and *prayers* which is afforded unto them. Is not your *bowing, kneeling, creeping, kiſſing, offering, ſinging, praying* to the Croſs and images notorious? yea your placing your truſt and confidence in them; Yea, have you omitted any of the abominations of the heathen, that you have not acted over again to provoke the Lord to anger? And

4. Do you think to relieve them from the guilt of *Idolatry* by a company of diſtinctions, which neither they nor you underſtand? The next time you ſee one of your *Catholicks* worſhipping an image upon his knees, I pray go to him and tell him that he muſt worſhip the Image with *dulia*, or *ſuperdulia*, but not with *latria*, or if with *latria*, yet not by *its ſelf* and *ſimply* but after *a ſort*, *analogically* and *reductively*, or that he is about a double worſhip;

one

one terminated in the image, and the other paſſing by it unto the examplar of it, and you will find what thanks he will give you for your good inſtruction. And how ſmall a portion are theſe of that *Maſs* of diſtinctions which you have coyned to free them from Idolatry who worſhip Images, who all the while underſtand not one word of what you intend by them, nor can any rational man reduce them unto any thing intelligible!

Sir, In this matter of *images* you talk of *coming up cloſe to your buſineſs*, and I was willing to take a little pains with you to direct you in your way, that having a mind to your work as you ſeem to pretend, you may not miſtake and wander away from your duty, but addreſs your ſelf unto that which you undertake and which is expected from you. You are to prove that there is *a neceſſity of receiving the uſe of images* in the worſhip of the Church, ſo that whoſoever doth not admit them, is to be caſt out of the Communion thereof; and 2. That theſe Images ſo received are to *be worſhipped and adored* with religious veneration, if not with the very ſame worſhip that is due to the Perſons repreſented by them, yet with that which redounds unto them; and that not only by the *outward geſture* of the body but the inward motions of the mind. And when you ſhall have proved that the *Doctrine* and practice of your Church in this matter of *making* and *worſhipping Images* is not contrary to the Scripture, or was ever received or approved by the primitive Church for ſix hundred years, I will promiſe you ſetting aſide all other Conſiderations, immediately to become a *Papiſt*: for the preſent I ſee no cauſe ſo to do, and ſhall therefore return to conſider what you here ſay for the further *adorning* of your pictures.

The firſt thing you reflect upon is my cenſure of that paſſage in your *Fiat*, that *the ſight of Images in the Church is apt to caſt the minds of men on that meditation of the Apoſtle*, Heb. 12. *You are come to mount Sion, to the City of the living God, to the Heavenly* Hieruſalem, *the Society of Angels, and Church of the firſt born written in heaven, to God the judge of all, to the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect, to Jeſus the Mediator of the new Covenant.* Theſe, I tell you, upon the ſight of an *Houſe full of Images* may be the thoughts of a man diſtracted of his wits, not of any that are ſober and wiſe. To which you reply, *mad men it ſeems can tell what figures repreſent, ſober and wiſe men cannot.* But who told you that your images *repreſent* the things mentioned by the Apoſtle? for inſtance, *God the Judge of all, the ſpirits of juſt men, Angels*, and the *Church of the firſt born*; or can any man unleſs he be greatly diſtempered in his imagination, fancy any ſuch thing. The *houſe of Micah*, Judg. 18. was notably furniſhed with *Images* of all ſorts. Judg. 17. he had בית אלהים *an houſe full of Gods*, or a Chappel adorned with Images, for there was in it פסל a *carved image*, and אפוד a *ſacred ornament* for it, and תרפים *leſſer portable Image*, and מסכה a *molten ſtatue*, Judg. 18. would it not think you, notwithſtanding the *gaiety* of all this proviſion, have been a *mad thought* in the *Danites* if upon their entrance into this houſe, they had apprehended themſelves to be come to the *Communion of the Catholick Church*, and therein to the *inviſible God*, to *Angels and Saints departed*? The truth is, there is *aliquid dementiæ*, a tincture of madneſs in all *Idolatry*, whence the Scripture teſtifies that men are *mad upon their Idols*, but yet we do not find that theſe *Danites* though reſolved upon falſe worſhip,

were

were ſo *mad* as to entertain ſuch vain thoughts as you imagine the *Chappel full of images* might have ſuggeſted unto them. Or do you think *Ezekiel* had any ſuch thoughts, when God ſhewed him in viſion the *imagery* of the houſe of *Iſrael* with all the Deities portrayed on the wall, and the elders worſhipping before them? *Ezek.* 8. God and the Prophet diſcover other thoughts in reference unto them. Beſides Sir, the Holy Ghoſt tells us that a *graven image is a teacher of Lyes*, Hab. 2. 18. and how likely it is, that a man ſhould learn any *truth* from that whoſe work it is only to *teach lyes*, I do not as yet underſtand.

You proceed to another exception; *the violation of an image* ſay you, *redounds to the Prototype if it be rightly and duely repreſented, not elſe.* To which you reply, and, *When then for example is Chriſt crucified rightly and duly repreſented? are you one of thoſe that can tell what figures repreſent or not?* 1. You do not rightly report my words, though you might as eaſily have done it as ſet down thoſe you have made uſe of. My words were, *that the violation of an Image redounds to the Prototype, provided it be an Image rightly and duely deſtined to repreſent him, that is intended to be injured*; which is ſo cleared by an inſtance there expreſſed, as turns your exception out of doors as altogether uſeleſs. For firſt, I require that the *Image be rightly and duly deſtined to the repreſentation of the Prototype*; that is, by him or by them who have power ſo to do, and by the expreſs conſent and will of *him* whoſe image it is, who otherwiſe is not concerned in it. Now nothing of all this can you affirm concerning your *Images*. 2. I require an *intention* of *doing injury* or contumely unto the Perſon repreſented by the image, without which

which whatever is done to the *image* reflects not at all upon him; And so a man may *break an Image* of a King which he finds formed *against his will* in some *ugly shape* to expose him to contempt and scorn, as I suppose out of *Loyalty* unto him, without the least violation of his honour, which is the very condition of your Images and those that reject them. And this also may suffice to what you add about hanging of *Traitors in Effigie*, which is a particular instance of your general Assertion that the violation of an Image redounds to the Prototype; which we grant it doth when the Image is rightly designed to that purpose by them who have just authority so to do, and when there is an *intention* of casting contempt upon it; the first whereof is not found amongst your Images, nor the latter among them who reject them.

Besides if all that were granted you which you express, yet what you aime at would not ensue. For though it should be supposed that the *violation* of an Image would redound unto the injury of the *Prototype* upon a meer intention of reflecting upon him, without which it is a foolish conceit to apprehend any such thing, yet it doth not thence follow that the *honour* done to an Image redounds unto him that is represented by it, provided that the intention of them that give the honour be so to do: For besides our *intention* in the worship of God, we have a *rule* to attend unto, without the observation whereof the other will stand us in little stead. And if this might be admitted, the *grossest Idolaty* that ever was in the world might easily be excused. That for instance of the *Israelites* setting up a golden Calf, and worshipping it, must needs be esteemed excellent, seeing they thought to give honour to *Jehovah* thereby.

thereby. When the things mentioned then are wanting, *Images* may be dealt withal as falſe money, which his Majeſty cauſeth every day to be *broken*, though it have his own Image and ſuperſcription upon it, becauſe *ſtamped* without his warrant.

You proceed and add as my words, *where the Pſalmiſt complains of Gods enemies breaking down his Sculptures, he means not thereby any Images or figures, but only wainſcot or carved Ceilings.* Would you could find in your heart *rightly* to report my words. The reaſon is evident why you do not, namely becauſe then you had not been able to make any pretence of a *reply* unto them; But yet this ought not to have *prevailed* with you to perſiſt in ſuch unhandſome dealing. My words are, *The Pſalmiſt indeed complains that they broke down the* פתוחות *or carved works in the Walls and Ceilings of the Temple* (though the Greeks render פתוחות *τὰς θυρὰς αὐτῆς her doors*, the Verb ſignifying principally to open) *but that thoſe* apertiones *or* inciſuræ *were not Pictures and Images for the people to adore and venerate, or appointed for their inſtruction you may learn.* You ſee Sir, I grant that the Word *may denote carved works*: and if ſo, I think they muſt be either in the *walls* or *ceiling*; that which only I deny was, that theſe פתוחות or *carved works* were propoſed to the people to be *adored* or *venerated*. This you ſhould have confuted, or held your peace. But you take another courſe; having *miſreported* my words to gain ſome countenance thereby unto what you had to except againſt them, you add, *Surely the Prophet wanted a word then to expreſs himſelf, or Tranſlators to expreſs the Prophet: If we muſt gueſs at his meaning without heeding his words, one might think it as probable that*

the

the Houſe of God was adorned with Sculptures of Cherubims and other Angels to repreſent his true houſe that is above, as with the Circles, &c. of wainſcot. Sir, the Prophet wanted not a word rightly to expreſs his meaning and intention; פתח is originally *aperire*, to *open*, and *ſolvere* to *looſe*, and becauſe *engravings* are made by opening the matter *engraved* with inciſions, it ſignifies alſo to *engrave*, as 2 *Chron.* 3. 7. ופתח כרובים *he graved Cherubims*, and thence is פתוחה Zech. 3. 9. *engraving*, or *work engraving*, the word here uſed by the *Pſalmiſt* expreſſing the effect of what is affirmed, 2 *Chron.* 3.7. and elſewhere. And this is well enough expreſſed by *ſundry Tranſlators*; and you ſpeak very faintly when you talk of the *gueſſing at the Pſalmiſts* meaning about the Temples being adorned with *engraven Cherubims*, as though you knew not certainly that it was ſo, or as though it were a thing at all queſtionable. Sir, the Text is expreſs for it, both in the *Kings*, *Chronicles* and *Ezechiel*; neither was it ever called in queſtion; but withall the ſame places inform us that there was as many *Palm trees* as *Cherubims*, and thoſe attended with *flowers* and *Pomegranats*; And the *Cherubims* in *Ezechiels* viſion had each one *two faces*, the one of a *man*, the other of a *young Lion*, the one face looking towards *one Palm tree*, the *other towards another*; all which we grant were uſed for ornament in that wonderfull and magnificent Structure; but ſo to imagine that they were propoſed to the people to adore and venerate, is a little *flowing*, if not *foaming* of the *madneſs* we lately diſcourſed of. That *Cherubims* were not Images, I ſhall ſhew you by and by. And I deſire to be informed of you, what *Palm tree* and *flowers*, or *Angels* with two faces, one of a man, another

of

of a Lyon, you think there are in heaven, that you ſhould ſuppoſe them repreſented by theſe *below*? you may eaſily diſcern how well you have evinced the concluſion manifeſted before, to expect ſome proof at your hands, by faintly intimating that the *walls* of the Temple were engraven with *Cherubims, Palm trees and flowers*, and therefore doubtleſs he that will not *worſhip Images* deſerves to be *Anathematized*.

You add nextly as my words, *The eye may not have her ſpecies as well as the ear, becauſe God hath commanded the one, and not the other.* You know full well that you do not expreſs my words, nor meaning as you ought. But I ſhall now ceaſe to expect *better dealing* from you, and make the beſt that I may of what you are pleaſed to ſet down. Speaking in general, I do not, nor did deny that the *eye* might have its *uſe* and the *ſpecies* of it to help and further our *faith* and devotion in the worſhip of God. It hath ſo in the *Sacraments* by him inſtituted; but I tell you it can have no uſe to theſe ends in things which God hath *forbidden*, as he hath done *the making of Images* for religious adoration. But you ſay, *Fiat Lux makes it appear that God commands both, and the nature of man requireth both, nor can I give any reaſon why I may not look upon him who was crucified, as well as hear him.* Pray Sir talk not of *Fiat Lux* making it appear. The deſign of *Fiat Lux* is rather to *hide* then to make any thing *appear*; and you might have done well to direct us unto that place in your *Fiat*, where you fancied that you had made it *appear* that God commands that *uſe of Images* in his worſhip which you plead for; and as for what the *nature of man requireth* we ſuppoſe God knows as well at leaſt as the Pope, and is as careful

careful to make *ſuitable proviſion* for its relief and help in the duties he calls us to the performance of. And it is an eaſie thing to give you a *reaſon* why you may not *look* on him that was crucified, that is with your *bodily eyes*, as well as hear him by the preaching of the word, and it is becauſe you cannot. You your ſelf tell us, when you think it for your purpoſe, that *Chriſt as to his humane nature is now inviſible*, and *that* is it I think you intend. Now how you will *look* with your *bodily eyes* on that which unto you and us is at preſent inviſible, I cannot underſtand. I know that one of the *great Fathers* of your *ſecond Nicene* faith, publickly affirmed in the Council with the approbation of his Aſſociates, that *Chriſt* is ſo preſent with, or related unto his *Image*, that he that ſhould ſpeak of it and ſhould ſay, *this is Chriſt*, ſhould not err. But I know alſo he did it with as much *wiſdom* as he whom the Prophet derides for carving a ſtock into the likeneſs of a man, and then ſaying unto it, *Thou art my God.* So Sir you *may not* with *your bodily* eyes look on him that was crucified becauſe you cannot; and as looking on the *picture* of him, which you mean, is nothing of that which we contend about: ſo I fear it is unto you only a *means* of taking you from looking after his *Perſon* in a way of *believing* which he ſo earneſtly calls us unto.

Your next progreſs is to ſome words of mine about the *end of preaching*, which you ſet down: *Nor is the ſole end of preaching as* Fiat Lux *would have it, only to move the mind of hearers unto correſponding affections; whereas* indeed they are; *he is miſtaken if he think the ſole end of preaching the Croſs and death of Chriſt, is to work out ſuch repreſentations to the mind, as Oratory may affect for the moving*

moving of Correſponding affections: which if you know not to differ very much from what you have expreſſed, I wiſh you would let theſe matters alone, and talk of what you underſtand. However, your *reply* unto what you are pleaſed to expreſs, is ſuch a piece of *ridiculous Scurrility*, as I ſhall not ſtain paper with a recital of. In *ſumm*, you deny there is any other *end of preaching*, and excuſe your ſelf that you thought not of thoſe other ends, which you ſuppoſe I might have in my heart, but yet conceal; and then inſtance in ſuch a *rabblement* of fooliſh wicked fancies, as I wonder how your thoughts came to be converſant about. As to the thing its ſelf I muſt tell you Sir, whither you are willing to hear it or no, that if you know no other *end of preaching* the Croſs and death of Chriſt, but meerly to work upon the minds of men, ſo as to *ſtir* up their Affections, that you are a *Perſon better skilled* in the *Maſs book* then the Goſpel, and much fitter to be employed *in ſacrificing* according to the Order of that, then in *preaching* of the Myſterie and Doctrine of this. Did never any man inform you, that *one end* of preaching the word was to *regenerate the whole ſouls of men*, and to beget them anew unto God? that it was alſo *to open their eyes*, and to illuminate them with the ſaving knowledge of God in Chriſt, that it was to *beget and encreaſe faith in them*; that it was to be a means of their *growth* in Grace, and in the knowledge of God; that the Word preached is *profitable* for *reproof, Correction, Doctrine* and *inſtruction in righteouſneſs*; that it is appointed as the great means of working the ſouls of men into a *likeneſs and conformity* unto the Lord Jeſus, or the changing of them into his Image; that it is appointed for the

refreſhment

refreſhment of the weary, and conſolation of the ſorrowful, and making wiſe of the ſimple? Did you never hear that the word *preached* hath its effect upon the *underſtanding* and *will* as well as upon the *Affections*, and upon theſe *conſequentially* only unto its efficacy on them, if they are not deluded? Is *growth* in knowledge, faith, grace, holineſs, conformity unto Chriſt, Communion with God, for which end the word is commanded to be preached, nothing at all with you? is being *made wiſe* in the myſterie of the Love of God in Chriſt, to have *an inſight* into, and ſome underſtanding of the unſearchable treaſures of his Grace, and by all this the *building up of ſouls* in their moſt holy faith, of no value with you? Are you a ſtranger unto theſe things, and yet think your ſelf a *meet perſon* to perſwade your *Countreymen* to forſake the Religion they have long profeſſed, and to follow you they know not whither? Or do you know them, and yet dare to thruſt in your *ſcurrility* to their excluſion? Plainly Sir, the moſt charitable judgement that I can make of this Diſcourſe of yours, is that it proceeds from *ignorance* of the moſt important truths and moſt neceſſary works of the Goſpel.

You next proceed to your plea from the *Cherubims* ſet up by *Moſes* in the Holy place over the Ark; and thence you will needs wreſt an argument for your *Images* and the worſhip of them. Although your *Vaſquez* is aſhamed of it, and hath caſhiered it long ago, and that worthily, as not at all belonging unto this matter: For 1. The *Cherubims* were not *Images*, to which you ſay, *ſince the real Cherubims are not made of beaten Gold, thoſe ſet up by* Moſes *muſt be only figures*; but it is of *Images* that we

we are ſpeaking preciſely, and not in general of *figures*; *figures* may include *Types* and *Hieroglyphicks* and any repreſentation of things. *Images* repreſent *Perſons*, and ſuch alone are thoſe about which we treat. And if a *Perſon* be not preſented by an *Image*, it is not his Image. Now I pray tell me what *perſonal ſubſiſtences* theſe Cherubims with their various wings and faces did repreſent? Do you believe that they give you the *ſhape* and likeneſs of Angels? It is true, *John* the *Biſhop of Theſſalonica* in your *Synod of Nice* with the approbation of the reſt of his company, affirms that it was the opinion of the *Catholick Church* that Angels and Archangels were not altogether *incorporeal and inviſible, but to have a ſlender body, of ayre or fire, Act.* 5. But are you of the ſame mind? or do you not rather think that the Catholick Church was belyed and abuſed by the Synod? And if they are abſolutely *incorporeal* and inviſible, how can an Image be made of them? Should a man look on the *Cherubims* as *Images* of Angels, would not the firſt thing they would teach him be a *lye*? namely that Angels are like unto them, which is the firſt language of any Image whatever. The truth is, the *Moſaical Cherubims* were meer *Hieroglyphicks* to repreſent the conſtant tender love and watchfulneſs of God over the *Ark* of his Covenant, and the people that kept it, and had nothing of the nature of Images in them. 2. I ſay, ſuppoſe of them what you pleaſe, yet they were not ſet up to be *adored*, as your Images are; To which you reply, *It is not to my purpoſe or yours that they were not ſet up to be adored; for Images in Catholick Churches are not ſet up for any ſuch purpoſe, nor do I anywhere ſay ſo. No man alive hath any ſuch thought, no Tra-*

tion, no Council hath delivered it, no practice infers it. And do you think meet to talk at this rate? have you no *Tradition* amongſt you that you plead for the *Adoration of Images*? hath no Council amongſt you determined it? doth not your practice ſpeak it? were you awake when you wrote theſe things? did you never read your *Tridentine Decree*, or the *Nicene Canons* commended by them? is not the *adoration* of Images aſſerted an hundred times expreſly in it? hath no man alive ſuch thoughts? are not only *Thomas* and *Bonaventure*, but *Bellarmine*, *Gregory de Valentia*, *Baronius*, *Suarez*, *Vaſquez*, *Azorius*, with all the reſt of your great Champions now utterly defeated, and have not one man left to be of their judgement? I would be glad to hear more of this matter. Speak plainly, do you renounce all *adoration* and worſhip of Images? is that the Doctrine of your Church? prove it ſo, and I ſhall publickly acknowledge my ſelf to have been a long time in a very great miſtake. But it was for this cauſe that I gave you a *little Image* of the Doctrine and practice of your Church in this matter, at the entrance of our diſcourſe, foreſeeing how you would prevaricate in our progreſs. Come Sir, if *Image Worſhip* be ſuch a ſhameful thing that you dare not avow it, deal ingenuouſly and acknowledge the failings of your Church in this matter, and labour to bring her to amendment. If you think otherwiſe, and in truth yet *like it well enough*, deal like a man, and dare to defend it at leaſt as well as you can, and more no man can look for at your hands. You mention ſomewhat of the different opinions of your *Schoolmen* in this matter, which you ſleight. But Sir, I tell you again, that you and all your Maſters are agreed that Images are to be *adored* and *venerated*,

rated, that is, worſhipped; and their diſputes about that *honour* that reſts *abſolutely* on the Image, and that which paſſeth on to the *Prototype*, with the kind of the one and the other, are ſuch as neither themſelves, nor any other do underſtand. You tell us indeed, *All Catholick Councils and practice, declare ſuch ſacred figures to be expedient aſſiſtants to our thoughts in our divine meditations and prayers, and that is all you know of it.* But if you intend Councils and practice truly Catholick or Primitive, you can give no inſtance of allowing ſo much to *Images* as here you aſcribe unto them; no *not one* Council can you produce to that purpoſe for ſome hundreds of years, but a conſtant current of Teſtimonies for the rejection of ſuch pretend expediencies and aſſiſtances. The firſt beginning of their uſe ariſing from Heathens, as *Euſebius* declares *Lib. 7. cap.* 18. But if you intend your *Roman Catholick* Councils and Practice, your Aſſertion is as devoid of Truth as any thing you can poſſibly utter. What kind of *Aſſiſtance* in devotion theſe your ſacred *Figures* do yield, we ſhall anon conſider.

It is added in the *Animadverſions* that it was *God who appointed theſe Cherubims to be made, and placed where they were never ſeen of the people, and that his ſpecial diſpenſation of a Law conſtitutes no general rule; ſo he commanded his people to ſpoil the Ægyptians, though he forbid all men to ſteal.* This was ſaid on *ſuppoſition* that they were Images or adored, both which I ſhewed to be falſe. And it is the anſwer given by *Tertullian*; When he was pleading againſt all *making up of pictures* which we do not. Now do you produce Gods ſpecial command for the makeing, uſe and *veneration* of your Images, and this conteſt will ſoon be at an end. But whereas God

who commanded theſe *Cherubims* to be made, hath ſeverely *interdicted the making of Images*, as to any uſe in his worſhip unto us, what concluſion you can hence draw I ſee not. To this you reply in a large diſcourſe wherein are many things *Atheological*. I ſhall briefly paſs through what you ſay. Thus then you begin, *We muſt know, you as well as I, that God who forbids men to ſteal, did not then command to ſteal as you ſay he did, when he bad his People ſpoil the Ægyptians under the ſpecies of a loan. Malum omen!* You ſtumble at the threſhold. Did I ſay that God *commanded men to ſteal? porrige frontem*; the words of the *Animadverſions* lay before you when you wrote this, and you could not but know that you wrote that which was not *true*. This *immorality* doth not become any man of what Religion ſoever he be. *Stealing* denotes the *pravity* of taking that which is another mans. This God neither doth nor can command; for the taking of that which formerly belonged unto another, is not *ſtealing* if God command it; for the reaſon which your ſelf have ſtumbled on, as we ſhall ſee afterwards. The *Ægyptians* were *ſpoyled* by Gods Command, but the *People* did not ſteal; for his Command who is the Soveraign Lord of all things the great poſſeſſor of Heaven and earth, *diſpenced* with his Law of one mans taking that which before belonged unto another as to that particular whereunto his Command extended, in reference whereunto *ſtealing* or the pravity of that act of alienation conſiſts, and ſo it is in other Caſes. It is *murder* for a Father to ſlay his Son. Neither can God command a man to *murder* his Son: and yet he commanded *Abraham* to ſlay his. To ſo little purpoſe is your following attempt to prove that the *Hebrews* did not *ſteal*, and that

God

God did not command them to ſteal, which you *fancied* or rather *feigned* to be aſſerted in the Animadverſions, that you might make a pretence of ſaying ſomething; ſo that it had been much better to have paſſed over this whole matter with your *wonted ſilence*, which relieves you againſt the things which you deſpair of returning a *reply* unto. You ſay, the *Hebrews might have right to thoſe few goods they took in ſatisfaction for their long oppreſſion, and it may be their own allowance was not paid them.* But this right whatever it may be pretended, was only *ad rem*, a general equity, which they had no warrant to put in execution by any particular inſtance: And therefore you add Secondly, *Becauſe it is a thing of danger that any ſervant ſhould be allowed to right himſelf by putting his hand to his Maſters Goods, though his Caſe of wrong be never ſo clear; therefore did the Command of God intervene to juſtifie their action.* But why do you call this a thing of *danger only*? is it not of more then *danger*, even expreſly *ſinfull*? Then is a thing morally *dangerous* when there *may* be ſin in it, not when unavoidably there *is*; then indeed there is danger of puniſhment, or rather certainty of it without repentance; but we do not ſay then there is danger of ſinning. It may be you do it to comply with your *Caſuiſts*, who have determined that in ſome Caſes it is lawful for a ſervant himſelf to make up his wrongs out of his Maſters Goods, which cauſed your friends ſome trouble as you know in the Caſe of *John de Alva*. You proceed and inſiſt upon the Command of God proceeding from his *Soveraignty and Lordſhip over all, warranting the Hebrews to take the Ægyptians goods and ſo ſpoil them, and that rightly.* But this ſay you, *can no way be applyed un-*

to Images: nor could God command the Hebrews to make any Images, if he had absolutely forbidden to have any at all made. Sir, This is not our Case, God forbad the Hebrews to make any images, so as to *bow down* to them, in a way of Religious Worship, and yet might command them to make *Hieroglyphical representations* of his care and watchfulness, and to set them up where they might not be worshipped. But let us suppose that you speak *ad idem*, and pertinently, let us see how you prove what you say: *For this*, say you, *concerns not any affair between neighbour and neighbour, whereof the Supreme Lord hath absolute dominion, but the service only and adoration due from man to his Maker, which God being absolutely good, and immutably true, cannot alter or dispense with. Nor doth it stand with his nature and Deity to change, dispence, or vary the first table of his Law concerning himself, as he may the Second which concerns neighbours, for want of that dominion over himself, which he hath over any creature, to take away its right, to preserve or destroy it, as himself pleaseth; and therefore you conclude that if God had commanded his people to set up no Images, he could not have commanded them to set up any; because this would imply a contradiction in himself.* A very profound *Theological* discourse, which might become one of the *Angelical* or *Seraphical* Doctors of your Church! But who I pray told you that there was the same reason *of all the Commands* of the first Table? Vows and Oaths are a part of the worship of God prescribed in the third Commandment; yet whatever God can do, your *Pope* takes upon himself to *dispense* with them every day. He so dispented with the Oath of *Ladislaus* King of *Hungary*, made in his Peace with the Turks, to the extream

extream danger of his whole Kingdom, the irreparable loſs and almoſt ruine of all Chriſtendom. So he diſpenſed with the Oath of *Henry* the Second of *France*, which ended in his expulſion out of *Italy*, his loſs of the famous Battail at St. *Quintins*, and the danger of his whole Kingdom. The ſtrict Obſervation of the *Sabbath* by the *Jews* was commanded unto them in a Precept of the firſt Table, and was not a matter between neighbours, but belonged immediately to the worſhip of God himſelf: according to your Divinity, God could not diſpenſe with them to do any *labour* that day: But our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath taught us that by his Command the *Prieſts* were to *labour* on that day in killing the Sacrifice, by vertue of an after exception. And your Book of *Macchabees* will inform you that the whole people judged themſelves diſpenſed withal in caſe of *imminent danger*. The whole fabrick of *Moſaical* worſhip was a thing that belonged immediately to God himſelf, aod was not a matter between neighbours, which had its foundation in the *ſecond Commandment*: and yet I ſuppoſe you will grant that God hath altered it, changed it, and taken it away. So excellent is your Rule as to *all* the precepts of the firſt Table, which indeed holds only in the *firſt* Command. Things that *naturally* and neceſſarily belong to the dependance of the rational creature on God as the firſt Cauſe, laſt End, and Supreme Lord of all, are abſolutely indiſpenſable, which are in general all comprized as to their nature in the firſt precept, wherein we are commanded to receive him alone as our God, and conſequently to yield him that obedience of *faith*, *love*, *honour*, which is due to him as God: but the outward *modes* and wayes of expreſſing and teſtifying that ſubjection and obedi-

ence which we owe unto him, depending on his *arbitrary inſtitution*, are changeable, diſpenſable and lyable to be varied at his pleaſure, which they were at ſeveral ſeaſons, before the laſt hand was put to the Revelation of his will by his Son. And then though God did abſolutely *forbid* his *people* the making of images as to any uſe of them in his Worſhip and Service, he might by particular exception have made ſome himſelf; or appointed them to be made, and have deſigned them to what uſe he pleaſed: from whence it would not follow in the leaſt, that they who were to *regulate* their obedience by his command, and not by that inſtance of his own particular exception unto his inſtitution, might ſet up any *other* images for the ſame end and purpoſe, no more then they might ſet up other Altars for Sacrifice beſides that appointed by him, when he had commanded that they ſhould not do ſo. Suppoſing then that which is not true, and which you can give no colour of proof to, namely that the *Cherubims were Images properly ſo called*, and ſet up by Gods command to be adored, yet they were no leſs ſtill under the force of his prohibition againſt the *making of Images*, then if he had never appointed any to be made at all. It was no more *free* for them to do ſo, then it is for you now under the New Teſtament to make *five* Sacraments more of your own heads, becauſe he hath appointed *two*. So unhappy are you in the Confirmation of your own ſuppoſition, which yet as I have ſhewed you, is by no means to be granted. And this is the ſubſtance of your plea for this practice and uſage of your Church, which whether it will juſtifie you in your *open tranſgreſſion* of ſo many expreſs Commands that lye againſt you in this matter, the day that ſhall diſcover all things will manifeſt.

You

You proceed to the vindication of another paſſage in your *Fiat*, from the *Animadverſions* upon it, with as little ſucceſs as the former you have attempted. *Fiat Lux* ſayes, *God forbad forreign Images, ſuch as* Moloch, Dagon, *and* Aſtaroth, *but he command his own* (Sir, *Moloch* and *Aſtaroth* were not Images properly ſo called, whatever may be ſaid of *Dagon*; the one was the *Sun*, the other the *hoaſt of Heaven*, or the *Moon* and *Stars*) but the Animadverſions ſay that God forbad any likeneſs of himſelf to be made; they do ſo, and what ſay you to the contrary? why, *You may know and conſider, that the Statues and graven Images of the Heathen, towards whoſe land* Iſrael *then in the wilderneſs was journeying, were ever made by the Pagans to repreſent God and not any devils, although they were deluded in it.* But 1. Your good friends will give you little thanks for this conceſſion, whoſe ſtrongeſt plea to vindicate themſelves and you from Idolatry in your image worſhip is, that the Images of the Heathen were not made to repreſent *God*, but that an *Idol* was really and abſolutely nothing. 2. God did not forbid the people in particular the making Images unto *Molock*, *Dagon* or *Aſtaroth*, but prohibits the worſhipping of the *Idols* themſelves in any way; but he forbids the making of any *Images* and *ſimilitudes of himſelf* in the firſt place, and of all other things to worſhip them. But what of all this? why then ſay you, *there was good reaſon that the Hebrews who ſhould be cautioned from ſuch ſnares, ſhould be forbidden to make to themſelves any ſimilitude or likeneſs of God.* Well then they were ſo forbidden, this is that which the *Animadverſions* affirmed before, and *Fiat Lux* denyed, affirming that they were the *ugly faces of Moloch* that were forbidden.

Moſes

Moſes ſay you, p. 294. *forbad prophane and forraign images, but he commanded his own*; but here you grant that God forbad the making of any ſimilitude or likeneſs of himſelf; the reaſon of it we ſhall not much diſpute, whileſt the thing is confeſſed; though I muſt inform you, that himſelf inſiſts upon another, and not that which you ſuggeſt, which you will find if you will but peruſe the places I formerly directed you unto. But ſay you, *what figure or ſimilitude the true God had allowed his people, that let them hold and uſe untill the fulneſs of time ſhould come, when the figure of his ſubſtance, the ſplendor of his glory and only image of his nature ſhould appear; and now ſince God hath been pleaſed to ſhew us his face, pray give Chriſtians leave to keep and honour it.* I preſume you know not, that your diſcourſe is *Sophiſtical* and *Atheological*, and I ſhall therefore give you a little light into your miſtakes. 1. What do you mean by *figure or ſimilitude* that the true God had allowed his people? Was it any figure or ſimilitude of himſelf, not of *Moloch* which you were ſpeaking of immediately before, and which your following words interpret your meaning of, where you affirm that in the *fulneſs of time* he hath given us the *image of himſelf*? have you not *denyed* it in the words laſt mentioned? have you no regard how you jumble *contradictions* together, ſo you may make a ſhew of ſaying ſomething? Do you intend *any other* likeneſs or ſimilitude? why then do you deal *ſophiſtically* in uſing the ſame expreſſion to denote diverſe things? 2. It is *Atheological* that you affirm Chriſt to be the image of the *nature of God*. He is, and is ſaid to be, the *image of his fathers perſon*, Heb. 1. 2. And when he is ſaid to be the *image of the inviſible God*, the term God is to be taken

ὑποστατικῶς for the *Person* of the Father, and not οὐσιωδῶς for the *nature, or substance, or essence of God.* 3. Christ is the *essenteal image* of the Father in his Divine nature, in as much as he is partaker with him of all the same *Divine properties* and excellencies, and morally in his whole Person, God and man as Mediator, in that the Love, Grace, Will, and Wisdom of the Father, are in him fully represented unto us, and not in the *outward Lineaments* of his humane nature, *Esa.* 52. & 53. And what is all this to *your Images* that give us the *shape and form* of a man, and of what individual person neither you nor we know? 4. And is it not a fine business to talk of seeing the *face of God*, which shone forth in Christ, in a carved image or a painted figure? Is not this to confess plainly that your Images are teachers of Lyes? 5. Your *Logick* is like your Divinity. *Inartificial* argument or Testimony you use none in this place, and I desire you would draw your Discourse into a *Syllogisme*. *Christ is the brightness of the Glory of God, God shews us his face in him*, therefore we ought to make *Images* of wood and stone, caved and painted, and set them up in Churches to be adored, ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι. And hereby you may also discern what is to be judged of your defence of what you had affirmed in your *Fiat*, namely *that we had a command, that we should have Images, and a command that we should not have Images*; which I never imagined that you would put upou a various lection of the Text, and thought it sufficient to manifest your failing, to intimate unto you the express preciseness of the prohibition, with which your *fancied command* for Images is wholly inconsistent. God hath strictly forbidden us to make *any Image* either of himself or of any other person or thing to *adore*

or

or *worſhip* it, or to put it unto any uſe purely religious. This is an everlaſting Rule of our Obedience. His *own making of Cherubims* and placing them in the moſt holy place whileſt the *Judaical Oeconomy* continued gives us no diſpenſation as to the obedience which we owe to that Command and rule, whereby we muſt be judged at the laſt day.

Your laſt exception is layed againſt what I affirmed concerning the *Relation* you fancy between the *Image* and its *prototype*, whereby you would excuſe the honour and worſhip which you give unto it, which I ſaid is a meer *effect of your own imagination*. To which you reply, *that ſpeaking of a formal repreſentation or relation and not of the efficient cauſe of it, you cannot but wonder at this illogical Aſſertion.* But Sir, this your *formal repreſentation* or relation which you fancy, muſt have an *efficient cauſe*, and hath ſo; a *real* one, if it be *real*; an *imaginary* one if it be *fictitious*, and this I enquired after; and I think it is not *illogical* to affirm that the relation you pretend is *fictitious* becauſe it hath no cauſe but your *own imagination* on which alone it depends. A divine inſtitution conſtituting ſuch a *relation* you have none, nor doth it enſue on the nature of the thing it ſelf. For the *carving of a ſtock* into the likeneſs of a man, gives it no ſuch relation to this or that individual man, as that which is done unto the one ſhould have any reſpect unto the other. But you add; *Is the picture made by the ſpectators imagination to repreſent this or that thing, or the imagination rather guided to it by the picture? By this Rule of yours the image of* Cæſar, *did not my imagination help it, would no more repreſent a man then a mouſe.* But you quite miſtake the matter; the *relation* you fancy includes two things; firſt that this *Image* repreſents

preſents not a man in general, but *this* or that *individual* man in particular, and that excluſively to all others; for inſtance; *Simon Peter*, and not *Simon Magus*, who was a man no leſs then he or any other man whatever. Now though herein the *imagination* may be aſſiſted when it hath any certain grounds of diſcerning a particular likeneſs in an image unto *one man* when he was living more then to another, yet you in moſt of your *images* are deſtitute of any ſuch aſſiſtance. You know not at all that your images repreſent any *thing peculiar* in the perſons whereof you pretend them to be the images, which ſufficiently appears by the varity that is in the images whereby you repreſent the ſame Perſon, even Chriſt himſelf in ſeveral places. So that though *every man in his right wits* may conceive, that an Image is the *image of a man and not of a menſe*, yet that it ſhould be the image of this or that man, of Chriſt himſelf, or *Peter*, he hath no ground to imagine, but what is ſuggeſted unto him by his *imagination*, directed by the circumſtances of its place and Title. When *Clodius* had thruſt *Cicero* into baniſhment to do him the greater ſpite, he demoliſhed his houſe, and dedicated it as a *devoted* place to their Gods, ſetting up in it the image of the Goddeſs *Libertas*. The *Orator* upon his return in his *Oration ad Pontifices* for the recovery of his houſe to overthrow this pretended *dedication* and devotion of it, pleads two things, firſt that the Image pretended by *Clodius* to be the Image of *Libertas*, was indeed the Image of a *famous* or rather *infamous whore* that lived at *Tanager*; had this dedication paſſed, I wonder how this Image could have any relation unto *Libertas*, but by vertue of the *imagination* of its worſhippers when in very deed it was the Image of a *Tangraan whore*; And

the

the *ſame Orator* tells us of a *famous Painter* who making the picture of *Venus* and her Companions for their Temples, ſtill drew them by *ſome Strumpet* or other that he kept company withall. And whither you have not been ſo impoſed upon ſometimes or no, I very much queſtion. In which *caſe* nothing but your *imagination* can free you from the worſhip of a *queen*, when you aime your devotion another way; Again he pleads, that the *Dedication of that Image* was not regularly religious, nor according to that inſtitution which they eſteemed *Divine*; whence no ſacredneſs in it could enſue; and want of *inſtitution* which may be ſo eſteemed, is that alſo which we object againſt your *dedication* of Images. For beſides a relation to *this* or *that* Individual perſon, which as I have ſhewed, the moſt of *your Images* have not, but what in *your fancy* you give unto them, which is natural or Civil; you fancy alſo *a religious relation*, a ſacred conjuction between the Image and Prototype, ſo that the worſhip yielded to the one ſhould redound to the other in a religious way. And this, I ſay, is alſo the product of your own fancy. If it be not, I pray, will you aſſign ſome other cauſe of it: for to tell you the truth, excluding *divine Inſtitution* which you have not, other I can think of none. And if you could pretend *Divine Inſtitution* conſtituting a ſacred relation between Images and their Prototypes, yet it would not preſently follow, that they were to be worſhipped, no not ſuppoſing the *Prototypes* themſelves to be the proper objects of religious adoration, which as to the moſt of them you know we deny, unleſs you have alſo a *Command* to warrant you. For there is by the Inſtitution of God himſelf a *Sacramental relation* between the water in Baptiſm and the blood of Chriſt; and yet I do

not

not know that you plead that the *water* is to be worſhipped. And thus is it as to your *wooden Croſs*; you put two ſticks a croſs and worſhip them, you take them aſunder and burn them; it is the very inſtance of your *Nicene Council*, for ſo they repeat the words of *Leontius* and approve them, *Act.* 4. ὡς μὲν ἐν συμπεπλεγμένα τὰ δύο ξύλα τῷ σταυρῷ προσκυνῶ τὸν τύπον διὰ χριστὸν τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ σταυρωθέντα, ἐπὰν δὲ διαιρεθῶσιν ἐξ ἀλλήλων εἰσβάλω αὐτὰ εἰς κατασκάφω; *whileſt the two ſticks of the Croſs are put together or compacted, I adore that figure for Chriſts ſake who ſuffered thereon; but when they are ſeparated, I caſt them away and burn them*; a pretty courſe, whereby a man may keep a *ſacred fire*, and worſhip all his *wood pile* before he burns it. And all this you are beholding unto your imagination for.

We have done with your exceptions and pleas, and I dare leave it to the Conſcience and judgement of any man *fearing God*, and not captivated under the power of prejudices and a vain converſation received by tradition from his Fathers, whither *your pretences* are ſufficient to warrant us to break in upon thoſe many and ſevere *interdictions* of God, lying expreſly in the letter againſt this uſage and practice, and ſo apprehended in their *intention* by the whole primitive Church. In the Command its ſelf, we are forbidden to *make to our ſelves*, that is in reference unto the worſhip of God treated of in that precept, not only פסל γλυπτὸν *ſculptile* a *graven Image*, but alſo כל־תמונה πᾶν ὁμοίωμα *any kind of likeneſs* of any thing in heaven, earth or ſea, ſo as that a man ſhould תשתחוה προσκυνεῖν *bow down*, adore, or venerate them, or עבד δουλεύειν *ſerve them* with any ſacred veneration. And the natural equity of this precept was underſtood by the *wiſeſt* of the Heathen.

then. For not only doth *Tacitus* witneſs that the antient *Germans* had no Images of their Gods, but it is known that *Nama Pompilius* the Roman *Solon* admitted not the uſe of them. *Seneca* decryes them, *Epiſt.* 33. and *Macrobius* denies that antiquity made any image to *the moſt high God*. What *Silius*, *Perſius* and *Statius* obſerved to the ſame purpoſe, I have ſhewed elſewhere. And from this Principle *Paul* pleads with the *Athenians* that the τὸ θεῖον, was not to be repreſented with *images* of Gold and Silver, or carved ſtones. Neither doth God leave us under this *interdiction* as proceeding from his Soveraign Authority, but frequently alſo ſhews the *reaſonableneſs* of his will, by aſſerting the *Incomprehenſibility* of his nature, and minding us that in the great manifeſtation of his glory unto the people, they ſaw *no manner of likeneſs or ſimilitude*, which ſhould have been ſhewed unto them had he been by any *ſenſible means* or matter to be repreſented. And yet, Sir, all this will not deter you from making *Images* and various *Pictures* of God himſelf and the bleſſed Trinity. Indeed you ſay you do not do it to repreſent the *eſſence* and *nature* of the Inviſible God, but only ſome *divine manifeſtations of his excellency or preſence*, ſo that thoſe images are only *metaphorical*. But you venture too boldly on the Commands of God with your *cobweb diſtinctions*; nor do you difference your ſelves hereby from the more *ſober Heathen*, who openly profeſſed that in their many names and *images* of God they had no deſign to teach a multiplication of the Divine eſſence, but only to repreſent the *various properties* and excellencies of that one Deity which they adored, as *Lactantius* will inform you. Neither I fear do you conſider aright, or ſufficiently eſteem the

ſcandal

ſcandal that by this means you caſt before the *Jews* and *Turks*, who abhor the worſhip of God amongſt you, upon the account of your Images; and Chriſtians alſo kept from participating in their *Sacra* by this means. *Lampridius* tells us in the life of *Alexander Severus*, that *Hadrian* the Emperour erected Temples in ſundry Cities *without Images* in them, untill he was forbidden by the Soothſayers, affirming that this was the only *way to make all men become Chriſtians*, as though the weight of the Controverſie between *Chriſtians* and *Pagans* had turned on this hinge, whither God were to be worſhipped in *Images* or no. As for *other Images* and Pictures which may as to a *civil uſe* be made, which you ſet up in your Churches to *be adored and venerated*, is not your Doctrine and practice a meer ἐθελοθρησκεία, *a will worſhip* condemned by the Apoſtle? *Col.* 2. 23. A worſhip deſtitute of *Inſtitution*, promiſe, command or any ground of acceptance with God. A *worſhip* wherein you do what is *right in your own eyes* like the people in the wilderneſs, and not that only which is *commanded* you, which God complains of and reproves, *Deut.* 12. 8, 23. And beſides you are converſant in *a will worſhip* of a moſt dangerous importance, wherein you aſcribe the honour that is due unto God alone, unto that which by nature is not God, which is downright *Idolatry*. I know how you turn and wind your ſelves into various forms and multiply *unintelligible diſtinctions*, to extricate your ſelves out of the ſnare that you wilfully caſt your ſelves into. But you all agree well enough in this, if your *Nicene* and *Trent Councils*, your *Baronius*, *Vaſquez*, *Suarez*, and other great Maſters of your *Sacra* may be believed, that they are to *be adored* and worſhipped, that is with *adoration religious*, which whatever

you may talk of its *modes*, or diſtinguiſh about it[s] *kind*, is to give the *honour due to God* alone unto ſtocks and ſtones. And the beſt *ſecurity* you have to free you from the horrible guilt of *Idolatry*, lyes in the pretended conjunction and religious relation that is between the image and its Prototype, which is plainly *imaginary* and fictitious. And, now Sir, I hope I ſhall obtain your *excuſe* for having drawn forth this diſcourſe unto a length beyond my intention, your ſelf having given me the occaſion ſo to do, by pretending that you would upon this *head of Images, come up cloſe unto me*, which cauſed me to give you a little taſt of what entertainment you are to expect, if you ſhall think meet to continue in the ſame reſolution.

CHAP. 22.

Of Latine Service.

THe 18. Chapter of the *Animadverſions* about *Tongues* and *Latine Service*, is your next task. Of this you ſay, that it hath *ſome colour of Plauſibility, but becauſe I neither do nor will underſtand the Cuſtomes of that Church which I am ſo eager to oppoſe, all my words are but Wind.* *Anſw.* No ſuch thing as *plauſibility* was aimed at in any part of that Diſcourſe. It was the *Promotion* or defence of *Truth* which was deſigned throughout the whole, and nothing elſe. For *that*, are all things to be done, and nothing againſt it. What you are able to *except* againſt in that diſcourſe, will ſpeedily appear. In the mean time pray take notice, that I have no *eagerneſs to oppoſe* either you or your Church; ſo you will let

let the *Truth* alone, I ſhall for ever let you alone, without oppoſition. It was the defence of *that*, and not an oppoſition to *you* that I was engaged in. In the ſame deſign do I ſtill perſiſt, in the *vindication* of what I had formerly written, and ſhall aſſure you that you ſhall never be *oppoſed* by me, but only ſo far, and *wherein* I am fully convinced that you oppoſe the Truth. Manifeſt that to be on your ſide, and I ſhall be ready to embrace both you and it. For I am abſolutely *free* from all reſpects unto things in this world, that ſhould or might retard me in ſo doing. But that I may hereafter ſpeak ſomewhat more to the purpoſe in *oppoſition* unto you, or elſe give my *conſent* with underſtanding unto what you teach, pray inform me how I may come to the knowledge of the *cuſtoms of your Church*, which you ſay, *I neither do, nor will underſtand*. I have read your *Councils*, thoſe that are properly yours; your *Maſs Book*, and *Rituals*, many of your *Annaliſts* or *Hiſtorians*, with your writers of *Controverſies*, and *Caſuiſts*, all of the beſt note fame and reputation amongſt you. Can none of them inform us what the *Cuſtoms* of your Church are? If you have ſuch *Egyptian* or *Eleuſinian* myſteries as no man can underſtand before he be *initiated* amongſt you, I muſt deſpair of coming unto any acquaintance with them. For I ſhall never engage into the belief of I *know not what*. For the preſent, I ſhall declare you my apprehenſion as to that *Cuſtome* of your Church as you call it, which we have now under conſideration, and deſire your *charity* in my direction, if I underſtand it not aright. It is your *Cuſtome* to keep the Scriptures from the people in an *unknown tongue*; ſomewhat contrary to this your former cuſtome, in this laſt age you have made ſome *Tranſlations* out of a *Tranſlation*

and that none of the beſt, the uſe whereof you permit to very few, by virtue of *ſpecial diſpenſation*, pleading that the uſe of it in the Church among the body of its members is uſeleſs and dangerous. Again it is the *Cuſtome* of your Church to celebrate all its publick worſhip in *Latine*, whereof the generality of your people underſtand nothing at all, and you forbid the exerciſe of your Church worſhip in a *vulgar tongue*, underſtood by the Community of your Church or people. Theſe I apprehend to be the Cuſtomes of your Church, and to the beſt of my underſtanding they are directly contrary, (1.) To the *End of God* in granting unto his Church the ineſtimable benefit of his Word and worſhip; and (2.) To the *Command* of God given unto all to read, meditate and ſtudy his Word continually. And (3.) *Prejudicial to the ſouls of men*, in depriving them of thoſe unſpeakable ſpiritual advantages which they might attain in the diſcharge of their duty, and which others, not ſubject unto your Authority, have experience of. And (4.) *Oppoſite unto, yea deſtructive of that edification* which is the immediate end of all things done or to be done in publick Aſſemblies of the Church. And (5.) *Forbidden expreſly* by the Apoſtle who inforceth his prohibition with many cogent reaſons, 1 *Cor.* 14. And (6.) *Contrary to the expreſs practice* of the primitive Church both Judaical and Chriſtian, all whoſe worſhip was performed in the ſame language wherein the People were inſtructed by preaching and exhortations which I preſume you will think it neceſſary they ſhould well underſtand; being (7.) *Brought into uſe gradually and occaſionally* through the ſtupendious negligence of ſome who preſided in the Churches of thoſe dayes, when the *Languages* wherein the Scripture was firſt written and

and whereinto for the uſe of the whole Church it had been of old tranſlated, as the Old Teſtament into *Greek*, and the whole into *Latine*, through the Tumults and Wars that fell out in the world, became corrupted, or were extirpated. And (8) *A means of turning the worſhip of Chriſt* from a rational way of ſtrengthening faith and increaſing Holineſs, into a dumb *hiſtrionical* ſhew exciting bruiſh and irregular affections; and (9.) Were the great cauſe of that *darkneſs and ignorance* which ſpread its ſelf in former days over the whole face of your Church, and yet continueth in a great meaſure ſo to do. And in ſumm are as great an Inſtance of the power of *inveterate prejudices* and carnal intereſts againſt the light of the Truth as I think was ever given in the world.

Theſe are my apprehenſions concerning the *Cuſtoms of your Church* in this matter, with their nature and tendency. I ſhall now try whither you who blame my *miſunderſtanding* of them, can give me any better information, or Reaſon for the change of my thoughts concerning them. But *Carbones pro theſauro*, inſtead of either further clearing or vindicating your *Cuſtoms* and practice, you fall into *Encomiums* of your Church, a *ſtory of a Greek Biſhop*, with ſome other thing as little to your purpoſe.

Fur es ait Pedo; Pedius quid? crimina raſis
Librat in Antithetis doctas poſuiſſe figuras
Laudatur.

You are accuſed to have *robbed* the Church of the uſe of the Scripture, and the means of its *Edification* in the worſhip of God, and when you ſhould produce your defenſitive, you make a fine Diſcourſe

quite to other purpoſes. Such as it is, we muſt paſs through it.

Firſt you ſay, *I have heard many grave Proteſtant Divines ingenuouſly acknowledge that divine Comfort and Sanctity of life requiſite unto Salvation, which Religion aymes at, may with more perfection and leſs inconvenience be attained by the Cuſtoms of the Roman Church then that of ours. For Religion is not to ſit perching upon the lips, but to be got by heart, it conſiſts not in reading but doing, and in this, not in that, lives the ſubſtance of it, which is ſoon and eaſily conveighed. Chriſt our Lord drew a Compendium of all divine Truths in two words, which our great Apoſtle again abridged into one.* Anſ. (1.) I hope you will give me leave a little to ſuſpend my *aſſent* unto what you affirm. Not that I queſtion your *veracity* as to the matter of fact related by you, that *ſome Perſons* have told you what you ſay, but I ſuppoſe you are miſtaken in them. For whereas the Goſpel is the *Doctrine of Truth according unto Godlineſs*, and the *promotion* of Holineſs and Conſolation (which cannot at all be promoted but in wayes and by means of Gods appointment) is the next end of all Religion; they can be no *Proteſtant Divines* who acknowledge this end to be better attainable in *your way*, then their *own*; becauſe ſuch an acknowledgement would be a *vertual renunciation* of their Proteſtancy. The *judgement* of this Church, and all the reall *grave Divines* of it, is perfectly againſt you, and ſhould you condeſcend unto them in other things, would not *embrace your communion*, whileſt you impoſe upon them a neceſſity of Celebrating the worſhip of God in a *tongue unknown* unto them, amongſt whom and for whoſe ſake, it is publickly celebrated. The reaſons you ſubjoyn to the con-

ceſſion

ceſſion you mention, I preſume are your own, they are like to many others that you make uſe of. The beſt ſenſe of the entrance of your words that I can make, is in that deſcription they afford us of the worſhip of your Church as to the peoples concernment in it. The *words* of it may ſit *perching upon your lips*, as on the tongue of a Parrot, or it may be, may be *got by heart*, or as we ſay *without Book*, when the ſente of them affects not your minds nor underſtandings at all. If in theſe vain looſe expreſſions you deſign any thing elſe, it ſeems to be an oppoſition between reading and ſtudying the Scriptures, or *joyning with underſtanding* in the prayers of the Church, the things under Conſideration, and the getting of the *power of the word* of God to *dwell in the heart*; which is *skilfully* to oppoſe the means and the end, and thoſe placed in that relation not only by their *natural aptitude*, but alſo by Gods expreſs appointment and command. So wiſely alſo do you oppoſe *reading* and *doing* in general; as though *reading* were not *doing*, and a part of that obedience which God requires at our hands, and a bleſſed means of helping and furthering us in the remainder of it. For certainly that we may *do the will of God*, it is required that we *know* it. And what better way there is to come to the knowledge of the will of God then by *reading* and meditating in and upon the word of Truth wherein he hath revealed it, with the advantage of the other means of his appointment for the ſame end in the publick preaching or propoſition of it, I am not as yet informed. And I wiſh you had acquainted us with thoſe *two words* of our Saviour, and that *one* of the Apoſtle, wherein they give us a *Compendium of all Divine Truths*. For if it be ſo, I am perſwaded

you will be to ſeek for your warrant in impoſing your *long Creeds*, and almoſt *Volumes* of Propoſitions to be believed as ſuch. But you cannot avoid miſtakes in things that you might *omit* as not at all to your purpoſe. Our Saviour indeed gives us the *two general heads* of thoſe duties of Obedience which are required at our hands towards God and our Neighbours; and the Apoſtle ſhews the Perfection of it to conſiſt in Love, with its due exerciſe; but where in *two* or *three words* they give us the *Compendium of all Divine Truths* which we are to believe, that we may acceptably perform the Obedience that in general they deſcribe, we are yet to ſeek, and ſhall be ſo, for any information you are able to give us.

In your following Diſcourſe you make a *floriſh* with what your Church hath in *Goſpels*, *Epiſtles*, *Good books*, *Anniverſary obſervations*, and I know not what beſides. But Sir, we diſcourſe not about what you *have*, but what you *have not*, nor will have though God *command* you to have it, and threaten you for not having it. You *have not the Scripture* ordinarily in a language that they can underſtand, who if they are the *Diſciples of Chriſt* are bound to read, ſtudy, and meditate in it continually; which are therefore hindred by you in the diſcharge of their duty, whileſt you *neither enter into the Kingdom of heaven your ſelves, nor ſuffer them that would.* Nay you have *burned* men and their Bibles together for attempting to diſcharge that duty which God requireth of them, and wherein ſo much of their ſpiritual advantage is enwrapped. Neither have you the *entire worſhip* of God in a *tongue* known to the people, whereby they might joyn in it, and pray with underſtanding, and be edified by what they hear

hear (which the Apoſtle makes the end of all things done or to be done in publick Aſſemblies) but are left to have their *brutiſh* affections led up and down by *dumb* ſhews, poſtures and geſtures, whereunto the Scripture and Antiquity are utter ſtrangers. Theſe things you *have not*, and which renders your Condition ſo much the worſe, you refuſe to have them though you may, though you are entreated by God and man to make uſe of them; yea where great and populous nations under your power, have *humbly petitioned* you that by your leave and permiſſion they might enjoy the Bible, and that Service of God which they could underſtand, you have choſen rather to run all things into confuſion and to fall upon them with fire and ſword, then to grant them their requeſt;

O curvæ in terris animæ & cæleſtium inanes!

But you add, *Beſides what you mention, what can promote your Salvation; for* ſay you, *What further Good may it do to read the letter of St.* Paul's *Epiſtles, to the Romans for example, or Corinthians, wherein Queſtions, and Caſes, and Theological diſcourſes are treated, that vulgar people can neither underſtand, nor are at all concerned to know. And I pray you tell me ingenuouſly and without heat, what more of Good could accrew to any by the tranſlated letter of a book, whereof I will be bold to ſay that nine parts in ten concern not my particular either to know or practice, then by the conceived ſubſtance of Gods will unto me, and my own duty towards him.* Sir, I ſhall deal with you without any *blameable heat*, yet ſo as he deſerves to be dealt withall, who will not ceaſe to *pervert the right wayes of the Lord.* And 1. who taught you to make your apprehenſions the *meaſure* of other mens faith and

and practice? If you know not of any thing needfull to *promote Salvation*, but what you reckon up in the uſage of your Church, hinder not them that do. It is not ſo much your own practice, as your *Impoſition* of it on others, that we are in the conſideration of. Would it worth ſuffice you to *reject* as to your own intereſt the means appointed of God for the furtherance of our Salvation, and that you would not compell others to joyn with you in the refuſal of them? Is it poſſible that a man profeſſing himſelf a *Divine*, a *Prieſt* of the Catholick Church, an *Inſtructor* of the Ignorant, an *undertaker* to perſwade whole Nations to relinquiſh the way of Religion wherein they are engaged, to follow him and his in wayes that they have not known, ſhould profeſs that he *knows not of what uſe unto the promotion of the Salvation of the Souls of men the uſe of the whole Scripture given by inſpiration of God is!* Be adviſed not to impoſe theſe *conceptions of your fancy and mind*, as it ſeems unexerciſed in that heavenly treaſury, on thoſe who have αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα, *ſenſes exerciſed* therein, ſo as to be able to diſcern between good and evil. If no other reaſon can prevail with you, I hope *experience* may give you ſuch a deſpair of ſucceſs, as to cauſe you to furceaſe. (2.) This *Vulgar people* that you talk of (as the Phariſes did of them that were willing to attend unto the preaching of Chriſt, ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, Joh. 7. *This vulgar rout that knows not the Law*) if they are Chriſtians, they are ſuch as to whom thoſe *Epiſtles* were originally written, and for whoſe ſakes they are preſerved, ſuch as Chriſt hath *redeemed* and *ſanctified* in his own blood, and given the *annointing* unto, whereby they may know all things, and are partakers of the Promiſe that they *ſhall be taught of God*. The

Goſpel

Goſpel takes not away the *outward differences* and diſtinctions, that are on other accounts amongſt the children of men, but in the things of the Goſpel its ſelf there are none *Vulgar or Common*, nor as ſuch to be deſpiſed; but *believers are all one in Chriſt Jeſus*; *Col.* 3. 11. *Jam.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. How it is now I know not, but I am ſure that at the *beginning* of the preaching of the Goſpel, the *poor* principally *received it*, and the greateſt number of them that were effectually called, was of thoſe whom you ſpeak ſo contemptuouſly of, as the Apoſtle teſtifies, 1 *Cor.* 1. 26. And the ſame is made good in all antient ſtory. Neither are theſe vulgar people ſuch *Ignoramus's* as you imagine, unleſs it be where you *make* and *keep* them ſuch, by detaining from them the means of knowledge, and who periſh for the want of it, as the *Prophet* complained of old. I ſpeak not of them who continue *willingly ignorant* under the moſt effectual means of *light*; but of ſuch as being really *born of God*, and becoming thereby a *Royal Nation, an holy Prieſthood* as they are called, yea *Kings and Prieſts unto God*, do conſcientiouſly attend unto his teachings. Of theſe there are *thouſands*, yea *ten thouſands* in *England*, who are among the *vulgar ſort* as to their Outward and Civil Condition, that if occaſion were adminiſtred, would farther try your *Divinity* then you are aware, and give you another manner of account of *Pauls* Epiſtles then I perceive you ſuppoſe they would. You are miſtaken if you imagine that either *greatneſs*, or *Learning*, or *Secular Wiſdom* will give a man underſtanding in the Myſteries of the Goſpel, or make him *wiſe* therein. This *Wiſdom* is from above, is wrought by the Spirit of God in the uſe of Spiritual means by himſelf appointed for that purpoſe.

purpoſe. And we know not that men of *any condition* are excepted from his diſpenſations of Light and Grace. 3. To whom, and for whoſe inſtruction were thoſe *Epiſtles of Paul* written? Were they not to the Churches of thoſe dayes? to all *that were at* Rome *called to be holy*, ch. 1. 7. and *to the Church of God that was at* Corinth *ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Cor. 1. 2. with all *that everywhere call on his name*. And why I pray may not the *Churches of theſe dayes* be concerned to know the things that the Spirit of God thought meet to inſtruct the former Churches in? Are Believers now grown unconcerned in the *Doctrine* of the Law and Goſpel, of Sin and Grace, of Juſtification, Sanctification, Adoption, the Obedience of Faith, and duties of Holineſs, which S. *Paul* reveals and declares in his Epiſtles? What would you make of them? or what would you make of the *Apoſtle* to write things for the ſtanding uſe of the Church, wherein ſo few were like to be concerned? Or do you think that there are but *few things* in the Scripture wherein the ſouls of the people are concerned, and that all the reſt are left for *learned* men to diſpute and wrangle about?

But you ſay, there are *particular Caſes in them, that belonged it may be only to them unto whom their reſolution was directed*. But are you ſuch a ſtranger in the *Iſrael of the Church*, as not to know that in the ſame Caſes, or others of a very neer allyance unto them determinable by the *Apoſtolical* Rules delivered in them, the Conſciences of your *vulgar people* are ſtill concerned? 4. Thoſe *Epiſtles of Paul* wherein you inſtance, were written by *divine Inſpiration*, and given out by the direction of the Holy Ghoſt for the uſe of the Church of God in all Ages; This I ſuppoſe you will not deny. If ſo, why do you ſet up your

wiſdom built on frivolous Cavils, againſt the Will, Wiſdom, Love and Care of God? I fear you are a *ſtranger* unto that Benefit, Strength, Supportment, Light, Knowledge, Grace, Wiſdom and Conſolation, which true believers, the *Diſciples of Chriſt* do every day receive by reading, ſtudying and meditating on *Pauls* Epiſtles. I wiſh you would mind ſome of old *Chryſoſtoms* Exhortations unto all ſorts of perſons to the reading and ſtudy of them; they are ſo interwoven in all his *Expoſitions and Sermons* on them, that it were loſt labour to direct you unto any place in particular. 5. The latter part of your Diſcourſe would make me ſuſpect that your converſe with the *Quakers* that you talked of in your *Fiat*, had a little tainted your judgement, but that I can aſcribe the riſe of it unto another Cauſe. Your preferring the *conceived ſubſtance of Gods Will before the letter of the Scripture*, is their very Opinion. But what do you mean by the *conceived ſubſtance of Gods Will?* Is it the Doctrine concerning the Will of God delivered in the Scripture, or is it ſomewhat elſe? If ſome *other thing*, why do you not declare it? If it be no other, why do you diſtinguiſh it from its ſelf, and prefer it above it ſelf? or do you conceive, there is a *conceived ſubſtance of Gods Will* that is taught, or may be by men, better then by God himſelf? 6. Somewhat you intimate, it may be to this purpoſe, in the cloſe of this Diſcourſe, *p.* 96. where you ſay, *the Queſtion between us is not, whether the people are to have Gods Word or no, but whether that Word conſiſt in the letter left to the Peoples diſpoſal, or in the ſubſtance urgently impoſed upon the people for their practice. And this becauſe you underſtand not, but miſtake the whole buſineſs, all your talk in this your eighteenth Chap-*

ter

ter vades into nothing. Truly Sir, I never heard before that this was the *ſtate of the Controverſie* between us, nor do I now believe it ſo to be. For (1.) We ſay not that the letter of the Scripture is to be left unto the *Peoples diſpoſal*, but that the Scripture is to be commended unto their *reverend uſe* and meditation, which we think cannot be ingenuouſly denyed by any man that hath read the Scripture, or knows ought of the Duty of the Diſciples of Chriſt. (2.) The *Conceived ſubſtance of the Word of God*, as by any man conceived and propoſed, is no otherwiſe the Word of God, but as it anſwers *what is written in the Scripture*, and by virtue of its *analogy* therewith. (3.) If by *urging the ſubſtance of the Word of God* on the People, you underſtand their *inſtruction* in their Duty out of the Word of God, by *Catechizing*, Preaching, Admonitions and Exhortations, as you muſt if you ſpeak intelligibly, why do you oppoſe theſe things as inconſiſtent? May not the people have the *uſe of the Scripture*, and yet have the Word preached unto them by their Teachers? Did not *Paul* preach the *ſubſtance of the Word* unto the *Bereans*, and yet they are commended that they *tryed* what he delivered unto them by the Scripture its ſelf which they enjoyed? And (4.) Why do you appropriate this *urging of the ſubſtance of the Word of God* unto your uſage and practice, giving out as *ours*, the leaving of the letter of the Scripture to the Peoples diſpoſal, when we know the former to be done *far more effectually* among Proteſtants, then among you, and your ſelf cannot deny it to be done more *frequently*? (5.) You reproach the Scripture by calling it *the Letter* in oppoſition to your *conceived ſubſtance of the Word of God.* For though the *Literal ſenſe*

of

of *Metaphorical* expreſſions (by you yet adhered unto) be ſometimes called the *Fleſh*, John 6. 33. and the *carnal ſenſe* of the Inſtitutions of the Old Teſtament, be termed *the Letter*, 2 Cor. 3. 6. Rom. 2. 2. yet the Covenant of God is, that his *Spirit and Word* ſhall ever accompany one another, *Iſa.* 59. 21. and our Saviour tells us, that *his Words are Spirit and life*, *John* 6. 63. and the Apoſtle, *that the Word of God is living and powerful, and ſharper then any two-edged ſword*, Heb. 4. 12. There is in the *written Word* a living and life-giving power and efficacy, which believers have experience of, and which I ſhould be ſorry to conclude you to be unacquainted withal. It is the *power of God* unto ſalvation, the *immortal ſeed* whereby we are begotten unto God, and the *food* whereby our ſouls are nouriſhed. And all this, is ſo not only as to the τὸ γεγραμμένον that which is *written*, but the ἡ γραφὴ the *writing*, or Scripture it ſelf, which is given by *Inſpiration* from God. For though the things themſelves *written* are the *Will of God*, and intended in the writing; yet the *Writing* its ſelf being given out by inſpiration, is the *Word of God*, and only original means of Communicating the other unto us: or the Word of God wherein his will is contained; formally ſo, as the other is materially. (6.) I find you are not well pleaſed when you are minded of the *contemptuous* expreſſions which ſome of your friends have uſed concerning the Holy Scripture; but I am now enforced to tell you that you your ſelf have *equalled* in my apprehenſion the very worſt of them, in affirming that *nine parts in ten of it concerns not your particular either to know or practice.* For I preſume you make the inſtance only in *your ſelf*, intending all other individual Perſons no leſs then your ſelf. The *Apoſtle* tells

tells us, that *all Scripture is given by Inſpiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for inſtruction in righteouſneſs.* You, that *nine* parts in *ten* of it do not concern us to know or practice; that is, not at all. He informs us, that *what ever things were written afore time, were writtn for our learning*, that we through patience and comfort of the Scripture might have hope; not above *one part of ten* of what is ſo written, if you may be believed, is uſeful to any ſuch purpoſe. Do you conſider what you ſay? God hath given us his *whole Word* for our uſe and benefit. *Nine parts in ten of it*, ſay you, do *not concern* us. Can poſſibly any man break forth into an higher reflection upon the *Wiſdom* and Love of the Holy God? Or do you think you could have made a more woful diſcovery of your unacquaintedneſs with your own duty, the nature of faith and Obedience Evangelical, then you have done in theſe words? You will not make thus bold with the Books that *Ariſtotle* hath left us in Philoſophy, or *Galen* in *Medicine*. But the wiſdom of God in that writing which he hath given us for the Revelation of his will, it ſeems may be deſpiſed. Such fruit in the depraved nature of man will ἀμαθία τῆς ἀνθολκῆς produce. The *practice* we blame in you, is not worſe then the *reaſonings* you uſe in its confirmation. I pray God neither of them may be ever laid unto your charge.

Your following words are a Commendation of the zeal and *piety of the dayes and times before the Reformation*, with reflections upon all things amongſt us ſince, and this I ſhall paſs by, ſo to avoid the occaſion of repreſenting unto you the *true ſtate* of things both here and elſewhere in the Ages you ſo much extoll. Neither indeed is it to any great purpoſe

poſe to lay open anew that darkneſs and wickedneſs which the world groaned under, and all ſober men complained of. You proceed to other Exceptions and ſay:

Where Fiat Lux *ſayes, That the Pentateuch, or Hagiography was never by any High Prieſt among the Jews put into a Vulgar Tongue, nor the Goſpel or Lyturgie out of the Greek in the Eaſtern part of the Chriſtian Church, or Latin in the Weſtern, you ſleight this diſcourſe of mine, becauſe Hebrew, Greek and Latin were Vulgar Tongues themſelves: I know this well enough: but when, and how long ago were they ſo? Not for ſome thouſand years to my knowledge. And was the Bible, Pſalms, or Chriſtian Lyturgie then put into Vulgar Tongues, when thoſe they were firſt written in, ceaſed to be Vulgar? This you ſhould have ſpoken unto, if you had meant to ſay any thing, or gainſay me. Nor is it to purpoſe to tell me that St.* Jerom *tranſlated the Bible into Dalmatian. I know well enough it hath been tranſlated by ſome ſpecial perſons into Gothiſh, Armenian, Æthiopian and other particular Dialects. But did the Church either of the Hebrews, or the Chriſtians either Greeks or Latin ever deliver it ſo to tranſlated to the generality of People, or uſe it in their Service, or command it ſo to be done as a thing of general Concernment and neceſſity? ſo far is it from that, that they would never permit it.*

I thought you would as little have medled with this matter again, as you have done with other things of the like diſadvantage unto you. For (1.) I told you ſufficiently before what a *vanity* it was to enquire after a *Tranſlation* of the *Old Teſtament* out of the *Hebrew* before the *Babyloniſh* Captivity, there being no other language but *that*

underſtood amongſt the Generality of the *Jewiſh* People. And I then manifeſted unto you, and ſhall dó ſo further immediately, that the Tranſlation of the Scripture into *Syriak* which you enquire after, could have had no other deſign amongſt the *Jews* in thoſe dayes, then your keeping of it in *Latin* hath; namely that the People might not underſtand it. For if you ſhall perſiſt to think that the *Jews* before the *Babyloniſh Captivity* at leaſt, had any other *vulgar language* but the *Hebrew*, you will make all men of underſtanding *ſmile* at you at an extraordinary rate. Some while after the return of the people from their *Captivity*, they began to loſe the *purity* of their own tongue, and moſt of them underſtood the *Syrochaldæan*, wherein about that time ſome ſmall parts of the Scripture alſo were written. In no long proceſs of time a great portion of them living ſcattered in the Provinces of the *Macedonian Empire*, and therefore called *Helleniſts*, uſed and ſpake the *Greek tongue*, their own ceaſing to be vulgar unto them. All theſe both in private, and in their *publick Synagogue* Worſhip made uſe of a Tranſlation of the Scripture into Greek, which was now become their vulgar tongue, and that made either by the *LXXII.* Elders ſent from *Jeruſalem* to *Ptolomy Philadelphus*, or which is more probable by the *Jews of Alexandria*, unto which City multitudes of them repaired, the Nation being made free of it by its founder; or it may be ſome while after by the *Prieſt Onias*, who lead a great Colony of them into *Ægypt*, and there built them a Temple for their Worſhip. So did theſe *Hebrews* make uſe of a Tranſlation, when their own tongue ceaſed to be vulgar unto them. The monſter of ſerving God by rational men with a

tongue

tongue whereof they underſtand never a word, was not yet hatched. The other portion of the people, who either lived in *Paleſtina*, or thoſe parts of the Eaſt where the *Greek tongue* never prevailed into common uſe, ſo ſoon as their language began to be mixed with the *Syrochaldean*, and the purity of it to grow into diſuſe, made uſe conſtantly of their *Targums*, or Tranſlations into that tongue. Neither can it be proved, but that the *Jeruſalem Jews* underſtood the *Hebrew* well enough until the deſtruction of the City and Temple by *Titus*. So that from the Church of the Jews you cannot obtain the leaſt countenance to your practice. And there lyes in *Gods dealing with them* a ſtrong Argument and Teſtimony againſt it. For if God himſelf thought meet to intruſt his *Oracles* unto his People, in that language which was *common* unto them all, hath he not taught us that it is his Will they ſhould ſtill be ſo continued? And is there not ſtill the ſame reaſon for it as there was at firſt? (2.) Farther, the practice of *the Latin Church* is unavoidably againſt you. For whereas the Scripture was no part of it written in *Latin* which was their *vulgar tongue*, it it was immediately both Old Teſtament and New turned thereinto: and therein uſed, as in their *publick Worſhip*, ſo by private Perſons of all ſorts, upon the encouragement of the Rulers of it. And no reaſon of their *tranſlation* of it, which they made and had from time immemorial, can poſſibly be imagined, but only the indiſpenſible neceſſity which they apprehended of having the Scripture in *a Language*, which the People did *generally ſpeak* and underſtand. (3.) The caſe was the ſame in the *antient Greek Church*. The New Teſtament was *Originally* written in their own *vulgar tongue*, which

they made uſe of accordingly. And as for the *old*, they conſtantly uſed a *Tranſlation* of it into the ſame dialect. So that it is impoſſible that we can obtain a clearer *ſuffrage* from the Antient Churches, both *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, and theſe both of *Latins* and *Greeks* in any thing, then we have againſt this cuſtom of your Church. *But theſe languages you ſay have ceaſed to be vulgar for ſome thouſand years to your knowledge. Bona verba!* You know much I perceive, yet not ſo much, but that it is poſſible you may ſometimes fail in your *Chronological faculty*. Pray *how many thouſand years* is it think you ſince Chriſts birth, now this year 1663.? or ſince the ruine of the *Greek* or *Latin Empire*, and therein the Corruption of their Languages. I believe you will not find it above three or four thouſand at the moſt, upon your next Calculation: though I can aſſure you an *ingenuous Perſon* told me, he thought from the manner of your ſpeaking *you might gueſs at ſome nine or ten*. What then? *Was the Bible ſay you put into other vulgar tongues when they ceaſed to be vulgar?* Yes by ſome they were: *Hierom* tranſlated it into the *Dalmatian* tongue: *Ulphilus* into the *Gotiſh*: *Beda* a great part of it into the *Saxon*, and the like no doubt was done by others. The *Eaſtern* Countreys alſo, to whom the *Greek* was not ſo well known, had Tranſlations of their own from the very beginning of their Chriſtianity. And for the reſt, ſhall the *wretched negligence* of men in times of confuſion and ignorance, ſuch as thoſe were wherein the *Greek and Latin* tongues ceaſed to be vulgar, preſcribe a Rule and Law unto us of practice in the worſhip of God, contrary to his *own direction*, the *nature* of the thing its ſelf, and the *example* of all the Churches of Chriſt for five hundred years?

For

For beſides that in the *Empire* it was alwayes *uſed*, and read in the vulgar tongues, thoſe Nations that knew not the *two great Languages* that were commonly ſpoken therein, from the time that they received the Chriſtian faith, took care to have the Scriptures tranſlated into their own mother tongue. So *Chryſoſtom* tells us, that the *Goſpel of John*, wherein occaſionally he eſpecially inſtanceth, was in his dayes tranſlated into the *Syrian*, *Egyptian*, *Indian*, *Perſian* and *Ethiopian* Languages. *Hom.* 1. in *John*. But you ſay, *Did the Church either of the Hebrews or Chriſtians, Greek or Latin, ever deliver it tranſlated to the generality of the People, or uſe it in their Service, or command it ſo to be done, as a thing of General concernment; ſo far is it from that, that they would never permit it.* But you do not ſufficiently conſider what you ſay. The *Hebrew* Church had no need ſo to do. God gave the Scripture unto it in their own *mother tongue*, and that only. And they had no reaſon to tranſlate it out of their knowledge and underſtanding. The *Greek Church* had the *New Teſtament* in the ſame manner, and the *Old* they tranſlated or delivered it ſo tranſlated by others unto the *generality* of the people, and uſed it in their Service. The *Latin* Church did ſo alſo. The Scriptures both of the Old and New Teſtament alſo being *originally* written in Languages unknown vulgarly unto them; they had them *tranſlated* into their own common tongue for the *generality* of the People, and uſed that Tranſlation in their Publick Service. The ſame was the practice of the *Syrians* and all other Nations of old, that had a language in common uſe peculiar to themſelves All your Plea ariſeth from the practice of *ſome* who through ignorance or negligence provided not for the good

and neceſſity of the Churches of Chriſt, when through the *changes* and confuſions that happened in the world, the *Greek* and *Latin* tongues ceaſed to be vulgar, which how many *thouſand years* ago it was, you may calculate at your next leiſure. This is that, which in *them* we blame, and in *you* much more becauſe you will follow them after you have been ſo frequently *admoniſhed* of your miſcarriage therein; for you add to your ſin by making that which was *neglect* in them, *wilful choice* in you, commanding that *not* to be done, which they only omitted *to do*.

But you will not leave this matter; you told us in your *Fiat*, that *neither* Moſes, *nor any after him did take care to have the Scripture turned into Syriack*. I deſired to know why they ſhould, ſeeing *Hebrew* was their *vulgar tongue*, and the *Syriak* unknown unto them, which I proved from the ſaying of the *Princes* of *Hezekiah*, when they deſired *Rabſhakeh* to *ſpeak unto them in Syriak which they underſtood, and not in the Jews Language in the hearing of the people* to affright and trouble them. This I did for your ſatisfaction, the thing its ſelf being abſolutely out of queſtion, and not in the leaſt needing any proof amongſt thoſe who underſtand any thing of this buſineſs. But you yet attempt to revive your firſt *miſtake*, and to ſay ſomewhat unto the inſtance whereby it was rectified, but with your uſual ſucceſs. Will you therefore be pleaſed to hear your ſelf talk *you know not what* in this matter once more? Thus then you proceed, *Sir you are miſtaken, for the tongue the Princes perſwaded* Rabſhakeh *to ſpeak was the Aſſyrian, his own language which was learned by the Gentry in* Paleſtine, *as we in* England *learn the French; which although by abbreviation it be called*

Syriack,

Syriack, yet it differed as much from the Jews Language which was ſpoken by Chriſt and his Apoſtles (whereof Eli Eli lama Sabacthani *is a part) and was over ſince that time called Syrian or Syriack, as French differs from Engliſh. And if you would read attentively, you may ſuſpect by the very words of the Text, that the Jews Language even then was not the Hebrew. For it had been a ſhorter and plainer expreſſion, and more anſwerable to their cuſtom ſo to call it if it had been ſo, then by a paraphraſe to name it the Jews Language: which if then it was called Syrian, as afterwards it was, then had the Princes reaſon to call it rather the Jews Language then Syrian, becauſe that and the Aſſyrian differed more in nature then appellation; though ſome difference doubtleſs there was in the very word and name, although Tranſlators have not heeded to deliver it.* Shibbolet *and* Sibbolet *may differ more in ſignification then ſound: nor is Britiſh and brutiſh ſo neer in nature as they are in name. And who knows not that* Syria *and* Aſſyria *were ſeveral Kingdoms, as likewiſe were the Languages?*

I had much ado at firſt to *underſtand* what it is that you would have in this diſcourſe; and no wonder, for I am ſure *you do not underſtand* your ſelf. And I am perſwaded that if you knew how many *prodigies* you have poured out in theſe *few lines*, you would be amazed at the product of your own imagination. For *(1.)* You yet again ſuppoſe *Syriack* to have been the *vulgar language* of the Jews in the dayes of *Hezechiah*, a thing that never fell upon the *fancy* of any man before you, being contrary to *expreſs Scripture* in the Teſtimony before recited, and all the *monuments* of thoſe dayes, wherein the *Sermons* of the Prophets unto the people are recorded in the *pureſt Hebrew*; neither had

the people as yet been carried *captive* out of their own land, or been *mixed* with ſtrangers, ſo as to have loſt their language as you imagine, unleſs you think that indeed the Hebrew was never their vulgar tongue. 2. You ſuppoſe, the *Syrian* and *Aſſyrian* at that time to have been *different Languages*, whereof thoſe who underſtood the one underſtood not the other: when they were but one and the ſame called לשון ארמי the *tongue of Aram*, neither was there ever any other difference between the Language of the *Aſſyrians* or *Chaldeans*, and that which was afterwards peculiarly called *Syriack*, but in ſome *few words* and various terminations, and how far this differed from the *Jews Language* you have an inſtance in the names given by *Jacob* and *Laban* to the ſame heap of witneſs, *Gen.* 31. 47. the one calling it בלעד *Galead*, the other יגר שהדותא *iegar Sahadutha*; neither was it at all underſtood by the *common people* of the Jews, *Jer.* 5. 15. (3.) You ſuppoſe that in the *Language* wherein *Rabſhakeh* and the Princes conferred, their *Syriack* was an abbreviation of *Aſſyriack*, becauſe in ſound it was ſo near the other, that they would have him ſpeak in. So that the Jews ſpeaking *Syriack*, when the Princes deſired *Rabſhakeh* to ſpeak *Syriack*, they meant another *Language*, as much differing from that, as *French* from *Engliſh*. But you are in the dark, and know not how you wander up and down to no purpoſe. There is nothing of the words that you pretend to be an *abbreviation* the one of the other in the Text, nor is there any ſuch *relation* between them as you imagine, that they ſhould be near in *ſound*, though not in nature. *Eliakim* entreats *Rabſhakeh* that he would ſpeak ארמית *aramith*, *Aramice*, that is, as the *Greeks* and *Latins* expreſs that people and Lan-

Language *Syriace* in *Syriack*; that he would ſpeak the language of *Aram*: which Language was ſpoken alſo by אשור the King and People of *Aſſyria*. And truly ארם *Aram* is no abreviation of אשור *Aſhur*, as I ſuppoſe. (4.) You talk of the lenghth of that expreſſion, *in the Jews Language*, when there is nothing in the Text but יהודית *Jehudith Judaice*, that is, in *Hebrew*. (5.) Some difference you ſuppoſe there was between the *Aſſyrian* and *Syrian* in *ſound and name, though Tranſlators have not heeded to deliver it*; When there is no agreement at all between them: but you ſay there was more in *nature*, when there was none at all. לשון ארמי *Laſhon Arami*, the tongue of *Aram* was the Language of *Aſſyria*, *Aſhur* being but a Colony of *Aram*. (6,)So you think that *Shibboleth* and *Sibboleth* may differ more in *ſignification then ſound*. But pray what do you think is the ſignification of סבלת as the *Ephramites* pronounced שבלת, juſt as much as a word *falſly pronounced* ſignifieth, and no more; that is, of its ſelf juſt nothing at all: For סבלת *Sibboleth* is no *Hebrew word*, but meerly שבלת *Shibboleth* falſly pronounced. 7. You imagine that the Language ſpoken by Chriſt, and his Apoſtles was the *ſame* that was ſpoken in the dayes of *Hezekiah*, and this you would prove from thoſe words *Eli Eli lama Sabacthani*, to be that which is now commonly called *Syriack*, and fancy an *Aſſyrian* tongue, as much differing from it, as *French* differs from *Engliſh*, which manifeſts your skill in the Oriental Languages; for want whereof I do not blame you; for what is that to me? but I cannot take it well that you ſhould *chooſe* me out to trouble me with talking about that which you do not underſtand. For here you give us *two Languages*, the *Syriack* and

and *Aſſyriack*, which names in the Original *differed but little in ſound*, but the languages themſelves *did as much in nature as French and Engliſh*. And the *Syriack* you tell us, was that which is now ſo peculiarly called, but what the *Aſſyriack* was you tell us not, but only that when the Princes perſwade *Rabſhakeh* to ſpeak ארמית *Aramith*, he intended an *Aſſyrian* language that was not *Syrian*. The boys that grind colours in our *Grammer Schools*, laugh at theſe *Mormots*. (8.) Neither do you know well what you ſay when you affirm that the *Language of Chriſt*, and his Apoſtles was the ſame that was ever ſince called the *Syriack*: for the very inſtance you give, manifeſts it to have been a different *dialect* from it; the words as recorded by the *Evangeliſts* being abſolutely the ſame neither with the *Hebrew*, nor *Targum*, nor *Syriack* Tranſlation of the Old Teſtament: That wherein we have the Tranſlation of the Scripture, and which prevailed in the *Eaſtern Church*, being a peculiar *Antiochian dialect* of the old *Aramæan Tongue*. And that whole language called the Syriack peculiarly now, and whereof there were various *dialects* of old, ſeems to have had its beginning after the Jews return from their captivity, being but a degenerate mixture of the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee*; whereunto alſo after the prevalency of the *Macedonian* Empire many *Greek* word were admitted, and ſome Latine ones alſo afterwards. (9.) You advantage not your ſelf by affirming that *Aſſyria* and *Syria* were ſeveral Kingdoms. For as *Strabo* will inform you, they were both originally called *Syrian*, and indeed were one and the ſame, until the more *Eaſtern Provinces* about *Babylon* obtaining their peculiar denominations, that part of *Aſia*, which contains *Comogena*, *Phœnicia*, *Paleſtina* and *Coeloſyria*,

Coeloſyria, became to be eſpecially called *Syria*. Originally they were all *Aramites* as every one knows that can but read the Scripture in its Original Language.

And now I ſuppoſe you may ſee how little you have advantaged your ſelf; or your cauſe by this *maze of miſtakes* and contradictions. For no errour can be ſo thick covered with others, but that it will rain through. The Jews you ſuppoſe to have *loſt their own language* in the dayes of *Hezekiah*, and to have ſpoken *Syriack*; the *Syrian* and *Aſſyrian* to have been languages as far diſtant as *French* and *Engliſh*; that when the Princes entreated *Rabſhakeh* to ſpeak the *Syrian* language ארמית they intended not the *Syrian* Language which was indeed the *Jews*, but the *Aſſyrian* quite differing from it; and ſo when they deſired him not to ſpeak יהודית but ארמית you ſuppoſe them to have deſired him not to ſpeak in the *Jews language*, but to ſpeak in the *Jews language* which you ſay was the *Syriack*. And ſundry other no leſs unhappy abſurdities have you amaſſed together.

But you will retrive us out of this Labyrinth, by a Story of what a *Greek Biſhip* did and ſaid at *Paris* in the preſence of *Doctor* Couſins *now biſhop of* Durham, *how he refuſed the Articles of the Engliſh Church, and did all things according to the Roman mode*, aſſerting the uſe of *Liturgies in the vulgar Greek*. Unto which I ſhall ſay no more, but that it was at *Paris* and not at *Durham*;

Græculus eſuriens in cœlum juſſeris, ibit.

I have my ſelf known ſome eminent members of that Church in *England*, two eſpecially; one many years ago called *Conopius*, who if I miſtake not, upon

on his return obtained the honour of a *Patriarchate*, being ſent hither by the then *Patriarch of Conſtantinople*; the other not many years ago, called *Anaſtatius Comnenus Archimandrite* as his Teſtimonials beſpake him, of a *Monaſtry* on *Mount Sinai*. Both theſe I am ſure made it their buſineſs to inveigh againſt *your Church* & practices, having the Arguments of *Nilus* againſt your Supremacy at their fingers ends. And if the *Greek Church* and you are ſo well agreed as you pretend, why do you cenſure them as *Hereticks* and *Schiſmaticks*, and receive only ſome few of them who are runnagates from their own Tents? What may thoſe whom you proclaim to be your enemies expect from you, when you deal thus ſeverely with thoſe whom you give out to be your friends? But as for this matter, of the Scripture, and prayers in an *unknown tongue*, though they tranſgreſs not with ſo high an hand as you do, the *old Greeks* being not ſo abſolutely remote from the preſent *vulgar*, as the *Latine* is from our Engliſh, and the Languages of diverſe other Nations whom you compell to your Church Service in that tongue, and beſides they have the *Scripture tranſlated* into their preſent vulgar tongue, for the uſe of private perſons; yet we approve not *their practice*, but look upon it as a great means of continuing that *ignorance and darkneſs* which is unqueſtionably ſpread over the major part of that Church: which in ſome places as in *Ruſſia* is to ſuch a degree, as to diſpoſe the people unto *Barbariſm*. We know alſo that herein they are gone off from the conſtant and Catholick uſage of their forefathers, who for ſome *Centuries* of years from the dayes of the Apoſtles themſelves, who planted Churches amongſt them, both had the *Bible* in their own *vulgar Tongue*, and made no uſe of any other

other in the *publick Service* of their Aſſemblies. And that their example in your preſent degenerate condition, which in ſome things you as little approve of as we do in others, ſhould have any great power upon us, I know as yet little reaſon to judge.

Your laſt attempt in this matter is to vindicate what you have ſaid in your *Fiat*, as you now affirm, *That the Bible was kept in an Ark or Tabernacle, not touched by the people, but brought out at times to the Prieſt that he might inſtruct the people out of it.* To which you ſay, I anſwer, *That the Ark was placed in the* Sanctum Sanctorum *which was not entred into but by the Prieſt and that only once a year*; And Reply, *But Sir I ſpeake not there of any* Sanctum Sanctorum, *or of any Ark in that place: was there or could there be no more Arks but one? If you had been only in theſe latter days in any Synagogue or Convention of the Jews, you might have ſeen even now how the Bible is ſtill kept with them in an Ark or Tabernacle, in imitation of their forefathers, when they have no* Sanctum Sanctorum *amongſt them. You may alſo diſcern how according to your cuſtome, they cringe and proſtrate at the bringing out of the Biblt, which is the only ſolemn adoration left amongſt them; there be more Arks then that in the* Sanctum Sanctorum; *if I had called it a Box or a Cheſt, or a Cupboard you had let it paſs; but I uſed that word as more ſacred.*

The oftener that you touch upon this ſtring, the *harſher* is the ſound that it yields. I would deſire you to free your ſelf from the unhappineſs of ſuppoſing that it tends unto your diſreputation to be eſteemed unacquainted with the *Jews* language and cuſtomes. If you cannot do ſo, you will not be able to avoid ſuffering from your own thoughts, eſpecially if you cannot forbear talking about them. This

was all that in your *former* diſcourſe you were obnoxious unto, but this *renewal* of it hath rendred your condition ſomewhat worſe then it was. For failures in Skill and Science, are not in *demerit* to be compared with thoſe in Morality, which are voluntary and of choice. Your words in your *Fiat*, after you had *learnedly* obſerved that the Bible was never in *Moſes* time nor afterwards by any high Prieſt tranſlated into Syriack for the uſe of the People, are, *Nay it was ſo far from that, that it was not touched nor looked upon by the people, but kept privately in the Ark or Tabernacle, and brought forth at times by the Prieſt who might upon the Sabboth day read ſome part of it to the people.* I confeſs your expreſſion in *the Ark or Tabernacle* was ſomewhat uncouth, and diſcovered that you did but obſcurely gueſs at the thing you ventured to diſcourſe about. But I took your words in that only ſenſe they were capable of; namely that the Bible was kept in *the Ark*, or at leaſt in *the Tabernacle*, that is ſome part of it, whereunto the People had no acceſs. And he muſt be a man devoid of reaſon and common ſenſe, who could imagine that you intended any thing but *the ſacred Ark* and Tabernacle, when you ſaid that it was kept in the Ark or Tabernacle. For not only by all rules of interpretation is the word uſed indefinitely to be taken *in ſenſu famoſiori*, but alſo your manner of Expreſſion will admit of no other ſenſe or intention. Now herein in the *Animadverſions* I minded you of your failure, and told you that not the *whole Bible* as you imagined, but only the *Pentateuch* was placed, not *in*, but *at the ſides* of the Ark. That the Ark was kept in the *Sanctuary*, that no Prieſt went in thither, but only the *High Prieſt* and that but once a year, that the book of the Law was never brought forth from

from thence to be read to the people; and laſtly that whatever of this kind you might fancy, yet it would not in the leaſt conduce to your purpoſe, it being openly evident that beſides the Publick *lections* out of the Law, that People had all of them the Scripture in their houſes, and were bound by the command of God to read and meditate in them continually. What ſay you now to theſe things? (1.) You change your words and affirm that you ſaid it was kept *in an Ark or Tabernacle*, as though you meant any *Ark or Cheſt*. But you too much wrong your ſelf; your words are as before repreſented, *in the Ark or Tabernacle*, and you remembred them well enough to be ſo, which ſo perplexeth you in your attempt to rectifie what you ſaid. For after you have changed the *firſt word*, the addition of the next leaves you in the *briars* of nonſenſe; *in an Ark or Tabernacle*, as though they were terms convertible; a *Cheſt* or a *Tent*. I wiſh you would make an end of this fond ſhooting at rovers. (2.) You apply that to the practice of the *preſent Jews* in their Synagogues, which you plainly ſpake of the *antient Jews*, whileſt their Temple and Church ſtate continued, wherein again you intrench upon *morality* for an Evaſion. And beſides you caſt your ſelf upon new miſtakes. For (1.) The Book kept in a Cheſt by them, and brought forth with the veneration you ſpeak of, is not the *whole Bible* as you imagine but only the *Pentateuch* which was read in their Synagogues on the Sabbath dayes ἐν γενεαῖς ἀρχαίαις as *James* tells us, *Act.* 15. 21. Only whereas their Law was particularly ſought after to be deſtroyed by *Antiochus Epiphanes*, they ſupplyed the room of it with the other parts of the Scripture divided into *Haphters* anſwerable unto the *Sections of the Law*. Nor (2.) Is

that

that brought out *to*, or by a *Prieſt*, but to any *Rabbi* that precides in their Synagogue worſhip; for they have *no Prieſt* amongſt them, nor certain diſtinction of Tribes; ſo that if you your ſelf have been in any *Synagogue* or Convention of the Jews, it is evident that you underſtood little of what you *ſaw* them do. (3.) For their *Proſtration* at the bringing out of the Book which you ſeem to commend as a ſolemn Adoration, it is down right *Idolatrous*, for in it they openly worſhip the *material roll* or book that they keep.

But what is it that you would from hence conclude? Is it that which you attempted in your *Fiat*, namely that the People amongſt the *Jews* had not the Bible in their *own language*, and in common uſe among them? You may as eaſily prove that the Sun ſhines not at noon day. The Scripture was committed unto them in *their own mother* tongue, and they were commanded of God to *read* and *ſtudy* it continually, the *Pſalmiſt* pronouncing them bleſſed who did accordingly. And the preſent *Jews* make the ſame duty of indiſpenſable neceſſity unto every one amongſt them, after he comes to be *filius præcepti*, or lyable to the keeping of any command of God. The Rules they give for all ſorts of Perſons, *high* and *low*, rich and poor, young and old, ſick and in health, for the performance of this duty, are known to all, who have any acquaintance with their preſent Principles, Practices, State and Condition. And you ſhall ſcarcely meet with *a child* amongſt them of *nine ytars old* who is not exerciſed to the reading of the *Bible in Hebrew*. And yet though they all generally learn the *Hebrew tongue* for this purpoſe in their Infancy, yet leaſt they ſhould *neglect* it, or through *trouble* be kept from it, they have tranſlated

the

the whole Old Teſtament into all the *Languages* of the Nations amongſt whom in any numbers they are ſcattered. The *Arabick Tranſlation* of the Mauritanian Jews, the *Spaniſh* of the Spaniards and *Portugues* I can ſhew you if you pleaſe. Upon the whole matter, I wiſh you knew how *great* the work is, wherein you are engaged, and how *contemptible* the engines are whereby you hope to effect it. But ſuch Poſitions, and ſuch Confirmations are very well ſuited. And this is the ſumm of what you plead afreſh in vindication of your *Latine Service* and keeping the Scripture from the uſe of the People. If you ſuppoſe your ſelf armed hereby againſt the expreſs *Inſtitution* of Chriſt by his Apoſtles, the *example* of Gods dealing with his people of old, the *nature* of the things themſelves, and *univerſal practice* of the Primitive Church, I really pitty you, and ſhall continue to pray for you, that you may not any longer bring upon your ſelves the blood of ſouls.

CHAP. 23.

Communion.

THE Defence of your Paragraph about *Communion* in one kind, is totally deſerted by you. I know no other cauſe of your ſo doing, but a ſence of your *incompetency* for its defence: ſeing you expend words enough about things of leſs importance. But you pleaſe your ſelf with the commendation of what you had written on this ſubject in your *Fiat* as full of *Chriſtian Reaſon, convincing Reaſon and Sobriety, and how it would have prevailed upon your own judgement, had you been otherwiſe minded.* You ſeem to dwell *far* from neighbours, and to be a very *eaſie man* to be entreated unto what you have a mind unto. But you might not have done amiſs to have waited a little for the *praiſe of others*; This out of your own mouth is not very comely. And I ſhal only take leave once more to inform you, that an oppoſition to the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt, the *command* of the Apoſtle, the *Practice* of the Primitive Church, with the *faith and Conſolation* of Believers, ſuch as is your Paragraph about Communion in one kind, whatever *overweening thoughts* you may have of the product of your own fancy, cannot indeed have any one grain in it, of Sobriety or Chriſtian Reaſon.

CHAP.

CHAP. 24.

Heroes: Of the Aſſes Head, whoſe Worſhip was objected to Jews and Chriſtians.

YOur laſt end endeavour conſiſts in an exception to ſomewhat affirmed in the twentieth Chapter of the *Animadverſions* directed unto your Paragraph about *Saints and Heroes*. And I am ſorry that I muſt *cloſe* with the Conſideration of it becauſe I would willingly have taken my leave of you upon *better terms*, then your diſcourſe will allow me to do. But I ſhall as ſpeedily repreſent you unto your ſelf as I am able; And then give you my *Salve æternumq; Vale*.

You tell us in your *Fiat*, that the *Pagans defamed the Chriſtians for the worſhip of an Aſſes head, and you give this reaſon of it becauſe the Jews had defamed our Lord Jeſus Chriſt whoſe head and half Portraicture Chriſtians uſed upon their Altars, even as they do at this day, of his great ſimplicity and ignorance*. Two things you ſuppoſe, (1.) *That the Chriſtians placed the Head and half Portraicture of our Saviour in thoſe dayes on their Altars*; which is alone to your purpoſe. (2.) *That this gave occaſion to the Pagans to defame them with the worſhip of an Aſſes head*, becauſe the Jews had ſo blaſphemed the Lord Chriſt as you ſay. Theſe things I told you are *fond* and *falſe*, and deſtitute of all colour of Teſtimony from Antiquity. That the *worſhip of an Aſſes head* was originally charged on the *Jews* themſelves, and on Chriſtians no otherwiſe, but as they were accounted a *Sect of them*, or their off ſpring, and that what in the ſame place you aſſert, of *the Jews*

accusing the Christians for the worship of Images, or the *Christians using the Picture of Christs head, or his half Portraicture on their Altars*, are monsters that none of the Antients ever dreamed of. What plead you now in your Vindication? quite omitting that wherein alone you are concerned, you only undertake to prove that the *worship of an Asses head* was imputed to the Christians as well as to the Jews, which you say *I deny, and say that it was not charged on the Jews at all.* And the reason of this charge you say, was, *because they were reckoned among the Jews in odiosis, and accounted of them.* So well do you mind what you had said before, of the rise of that imputation on the Christians, from the blasphemy of the Jews. So (1.) In your *Fiat* you say nothing of the *Jews* at all, but only that by their calumnies, the *Pagans* took occasion to slander the Christians; being now *better instructed by the Animadversions*, in the rise of that *foolish calumny*, you change your note and close in with what is in them asserted. (2.) You unduely affirm that I deny *this to have been charged on the Christians*, when I grant it was, and that in the very same manner and on the same account, that your self, now contrary to what you had written before, acknowledge it to have been. He must be as much unacquainted with these things, as some body else whom I shall not name *honoris gratia*, seems to be, who knows not that this *foolish impiety* was imputed in process of time to the *Christians*, by the Pagans, among a litter of other follies, as well as unto the *Jews*. *Cæcilius* in *Minucius* tells us, *audio eos ineptissimæ pecudis Caput Asini consecratum inepta nescio qua persuasione venerari: I hear that by a foolish perswasion they worship the head of an Ass, a vile beast.* And *Tertullian*

tullian Apol. cap. 16. *Nam quidam ſomniaſtis Caput Aſininum eſſe Deum noſtrum. Some of you dream that an Aſſes head is our God,* preſently declaring thereon, that this imputation was derived on them from the *Jews*, who firſt ſuffered under that Fable. And if any thing gave new occaſion unto it among the Chriſtians, it was not the *Picture of Chriſt deſpiſed by the Jews* as you imagine, but the report of *his riding on an Aſs*; which *Athanaſius* takes notice of, *Homil. ad Pagan.* they ſaid ὅτι ὁ θεὸς χριστιανῶν ὁ καλούμενος χριστὸς εἰς ὄνάριον ἐκαθίσεν, *that the God of the Chriſtians, who is called Chriſt, ſate on an Aſs.* But you will prove what you ſay out of *Tertullian*; ſay you, *the ſame* Tertullian *in his Apologeticks adds theſe words, The Calumnies,* ſaith he, *invented to cry down our Religion grew to ſuch an exceſs of impiety that not long ago in this very City, a picture of our God was ſhewn by a certain infamous Perſon, with the ears of an Aſs, and a hoof on one foot, cloathed with a gown, and a book in his hand with this inſcription,* Onochoetes *the God of the Chriſtians; And he adds that the Chriſtians in the City as they were much offended with the impiety, ſo did they not a little wonder at the ſtrange uncouth name the villain had put upon our Lord and Maſter.* Onochoetes, *forſooth he muſt be called* Onochoëtes. In this Teſtimony of you know not what, you triumph and conclude, *are you not a ſtrange man to tell me that what I ſpeak of this buſineſs is notoriouſly falſe; nay and that I know it is falſe, and that I cannot produce one Authentick Teſtimony, no not one, of any ſuch thing: but this is your Ordinary Confidence.* Seriouſly Sir, I wonder where you got this Quotation out of *Tertullian?* Let me deſire you to be wary in receiving any thing hereafter from the ſame hand, out

accusing the Christians for the worship of Images, or the *Christians using the Picture of Christs head, or his half Portraicture on their Altars*, are monsters that none of the Antients ever dreamed of. What plead you now in your Vindication? quite omitting that wherein alone you are concerned, you only undertake to prove that the *worship of an Asses head* was imputed to the Christians as well as to the Jews, which you say *I deny, and say that it was not charged on the Jews at all.* And the reason of this charge you say, was, *because they were reckoned among the Jews in odiosis, and accounted of them.* So well do you mind what you had said before, of the rise of that imputation on the Christians, from the blasphemy of the Jews. So (1.) In your *Fiat* you say nothing of the *Jews* at all, but only that by their calumnies, the *Pagans* took occasion to slander the Christians; being now *better instructed by the Animadversions*, in the rise of that *foolish calumny*, you change your note and close in with what is in them asserted. (2.) You unduely affirm that I deny *this to have been charged on the Christians*, when I grant it was, and that in the very same manner and on the same account, that your self, now contrary to what you had written before, acknowledge it to have been. He must be as much unacquainted with these things, as some body else whom I shall not name *honoris gratia*, seems to be, who knows not that this *foolish impiety* was imputed in process of time to the *Christians*, by the Pagans, among a litter of other follies, as well as unto the *Jews*. *Cæcilius* in *Minucius* tells us, *audio eos ineptissimæ pecudis Caput Asini consecratum inepta nescio qua persuasione venerari: I hear that by a foolish perswasion they worship the head of an Ass, a vile beast.* And *Tertullian*

tullian Apol. cap. 16. *Nam quidam ſomniaſtis Caput Aſininum eſſe Deum noſtrum. Some of you dream that an Aſſes head is our God*, preſently declaring thereon, that this imputation was derived on them from the *Jews*, who firſt ſuffered under that Fable. And if any thing gave new occaſion unto it among the Chriſtians, it was not the *Picture of Chriſt deſpiſed by the Jews* as you imagine, but the report of *his riding on an Aſs*; which *Athanaſius* takes notice of, *Homil. ad Pagan.* they ſaid ὅτι ὁ θεὸς χριστιανῶν ὁ καλούμενος χριστὸς ἐπὶ ὑποζυγίου ἐκαθέζετο, *that the God of the Chriſtians, who is called Chriſt, ſate on an Aſs.* But you will prove what you ſay out of *Tertullian*; ſay you, *the ſame* Tertullian *in his Apologeticks adds theſe words, The Calumnies*, ſaith he, *invented to cry down our Religion grew to ſuch an exceſs of impiety that not long ago in this very City, a picture of our God was ſhewn by a certain infamous Perſon, with the ears of an Aſs, and a hoof on one foot, cloathed with a gown, and a book in his hand with this inſcription*, Onochoetes *the God of the Chriſtians*; *And he adds that the Chriſtians in the City as they were much offended with the impiety, ſo did they not a little wonder at the ſtrange uncouth name the villain had put upon our Lord and Maſter.* Onochoetes, *forſooth he muſt be called* Onochoëtes. In this Teſtimony of you know not what, you triumph and conclude, *are you not a ſtrange man to tell me that what I ſpeak of this buſineſs is notoriouſly falſe*; *nay and that I know it is falſe, and that I cannot produce one Authentick Teſtimony, no not one, of any ſuch thing: but this is your Ordinary Confidence.* Seriouſly Sir, I wonder where you got this Quotation out of *Tertullian?* Let me deſire you to be wary in receiving any thing hereafter from the ſame hand, out

of *Authors* that you want the Confidence to venture upon your ſelf. The words of *Tertullian*, which your *Tranſlator* hath abuſed you in, are theſe: *Sed nova jam Dei noſtri in iſta Civitate proxime editio publicata eſt, ex quo quidam in fruſtrandis beſtiis mercenarius noxius picturam propoſuit cum ejuſmodi inſcriptione, Deus Chriſtianorum* Ononychites, *is erat auribus Aſininis, altero pede ungulatus, librum geſtans & togatus; riſimus & nomen & formam. Sed illi debebant adorare ſtatim biforme numen qui canino & leonino capite commiſtos Deos receperunt. Lately in that City* (that is Rome) *there was a publick ſhew made of our God; wherein a guilty Perſon hired to fight with wild beaſts, and to conſin their rage, propoſed a Picture with this Inſcription* Ononychites *the God of the Chriſtians: he had Aſſes ears, hoofed on one foot, carrying a Book and in a gown: we laughed at the name and ſhape; but they ought immediately to have adored this double ſhaped Deity, who have received Gods mingled with Doggs and Lyons heads.* You ſee how well you have given us the *words of Tertullian*, which you pretend to do, ſaying, *he adds theſe words.* But I confeſs though he ſayes no ſuch matter, it is like enough he would have *wondred* at the name of *Onochoetes*, had the villain given it unto his picture: For neither he, nor any man elſe knows what it ſhould mean. He knew well enough what *Ononychites* ſignified, and laughed at it. It is but *Aſinungulus*, which it may be comes neerer their underſtanding. I confeſs ſome would read it *Onochoerites*, as if it were compounded of ὄν☉ and χοῖρ☉, becauſe of thoſe words of *Epiphanius* concerning the *Gnoſticks*, φασὶ δὲ τὸν Σαβαὼθ, ὅτι μὲν ὄνου μορφὴν ἔχει, ὅτι δὲ χοίρου. *Some ſay their Sabaoth had the form of an Aſs, ſome of a Hogg.* But *Tertullian* in the deſcription of

of the Picture mentions no part of a *Hogg*, nor rejects the abomination *of the Gnoſticks*, as was the manner of the Chriſtians when charged with their fillineſs and folly, as may be ſeen abundantly in *Origen* againſt *Celſus*. But who, or what your *Onochoetes* ſhould be, no man knows. But ſee your further unhappineſs. You prove not by your *Quotation* that which no man denyes, namely that the *Chriſtians alſo* were charged with the *worſhip of an Aſſes head*, which if you had but looked into *Tertullian* himſelf, you muſt have found him expreſly affirming it in the *beginning* of that Chapter, from whence your ſtory is taken. Much leſs do you prove any thing of the *Chriſtians placing the head and half Portraicture of our Saviour upon their Altars*, before or in the dayes of *Conſtantine*, which was that alone that was incumbent on you to have done. And now to give a brief view of that *whole Portraicture* that you have drawn of your ſelf in your Epiſtle, I ſhall only mind you of thoſe *words of mine, that your Aſſertions were notoriouſly falſe, and that you could not produce ſo much as one Teſtimony of any ſuch thing*, were not by me uſed at all in reference unto the *Pagans* charge upon the Chriſtians for *worſhipping an Aſſes head*, but unto what you ſaid about the uſe of the *Picture of Chriſt on the Altars of Chriſtians*, with the riſe of the charge mentioned from thence. This you *know* to be ſo; for my words muſt needs *lye before you* in your attempt for a reply unto them, and finding them to be true, and that you were not able to produce *one* Teſtimony, no *not one* in the confirmation of what you had written; you pretend them now to be ſpoken in reference unto that whereunto you know they did not at all relate, the thing it ſelf being acknowledged by

by me. This dealing becomes not any man pretending to ingenuity, or profeſſing Chriſtianity.

What remains of your Epiſtle, is *Perſonal*; Men are buſie, and not ſo far concerned, I am *ſure in me*, nor (I am almoſt perſwaded) in *you* as to trouble themſelves with the peruſal of what belongs unto us perſonally. For my part I know it is my duty in *all things*, eſpecially in thoſe that are of ſuch *near concernment* unto his Glory, as are all his Truths, and Worſhip, to commend my conſcience unto God, and to be converſant in them in *ſimplicity* and godly ſincerity, and not in *fleſhly wiſdom*, not corrupting the word of Truth, nor lying in wait with any *ſubtile ſleights* to deceive. And this through his Grace I ſhall attend unto, whatever *reward* I may meet withal in this world. For I know *in whom I have believed, who is able to keep that which I deſire to commit unto him*. And for your part, I deſire your proſperity as my own. I rejoyce in your quiet, and ſhall never envy you your liberty, and do pray that you may receive *Grace*, *Truth* and *Peace* from him, who alone is able to beſtow them on you.

FINIS.